

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1317301



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE THREE TRADITIONS
IN THE GOSPELS

AN ESSAY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

The Resurrection and Other
Gospel Narratives and the
Narratives of the Virgin Birth

Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

'The book is a masterpiece of exegesis.'
The Guardian.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.

LONDON

BOMBAY

NEW YORK

CALCUTTA

TORONTO

MADRAS

THE THREE TRADITIONS IN THE GOSPELS

BS
255
156

AN ESSAY

BY

W. LOCKTON, B.D.

VICE-PRINCIPAL AND LECTURER IN MATHEMATICS
WINCHESTER DIOCESAN TRAINING COLLEGE

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4

NEW YORK, TORONTO

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS

1926

Made in Great Britain

PREFACE

THE essay which follows is an expansion of a paper prepared for the Salisbury Clerical Society. It is a continuation of the line of argument put forward by the writer in an article on 'The Origin of the Gospels,' which appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review* in July 1922, and in his essays on the Resurrection and the Virgin Birth, published in 1924. By all but a few critics his earlier work was well received, but several, in spite of the statement to the contrary in the preface of the former book, seemed to think that the theory of the priority of Luke would be useless for the explanation of the gospels as a whole, though for special reasons it might seem to give more or less satisfactory results when applied to the Resurrection narratives. Yet the writer's conviction of the truth of the hypothesis was reached not by the investigation of a few passages only, but by an examination of the gospels in their entirety,

AI1959

School of Theology
at Claremont

PREFACE

every verse and every word, and its application to the Resurrection stories was intended only as a specially useful example of what was possible on a much larger scale, but quite impracticable because of the prohibitive cost of printing. It is hoped that the subject-matter of the present essay, though by no means exhaustive, is at any rate sufficiently wide and general to make a repetition of this particular criticism quite impossible. Whether the arguments carry conviction or not, the unprejudiced reader will see that it is possible to put forward an explanation of the origin of the gospels quite apart from the popular Mark-Q hypothesis, which indeed, however modified, seems to create more difficulties than it solves, and that the writer's views on the Synoptic Problem are not merely the result of ignorance and a rather superficial acquaintance with the literature of the subject, as several critics kindly suggested. Though ever ready to learn from the researches of other students—English, American, French or German—on questions of Gospel origins as on others, the writer is not content to take his views on authority, but is audacious enough to think for himself, and, whatever its faults, he claims that the essay which follows is largely

original, and not merely a reshuffling of the results of earlier researches with the dotting of a few i's and the crossing of a few t's, which by a surprising number of people seems to be regarded as a sufficient basis for a new book on the origin of the gospels. In some directions it will be seen that the writer has carried the argument a little further than in the previous essays, and on one or two points, not of primary importance, he has not hesitated to modify his earlier conclusions in the light of continued research.

Probably certain of the conclusions will come as a surprise, perhaps even as a shock, to some of his readers. They are in all cases however the genuine results of the writer's study and research, and in no detail is there an attempt to bolster up opinions held on other grounds. Some of the conclusions were indeed as surprising to the writer when first reached as they are likely to be to any of his readers, but it is hoped that they will be judged on their merits and not condemned apart from the arguments as being only the fantasies of an unknown author and unworthy of serious consideration. Any reasonable criticism he will gladly welcome.

The writer is conscious that the book will be in many places by no means easy to read,

in part doubtless as a result of his own literary incapacity, but in part because of the nature of the problems discussed. Without a synopsis of the gospels at hand for constant reference much of it, he is afraid, will be scarcely intelligible. Ideally the numerous quotations from the New Testament and Septuagint should have been given in the original Greek, but the expense of printing made it quite impracticable, and, even if practicable, it would necessarily have limited the number of possible readers to such small dimensions as to be undesirable. The use, where available, of a Greek synopsis, together with the Greek New Testament and Septuagint, will however do much to remedy for the more learned the defects of quotations in English. As a rule quotations from the New Testament and Apocrypha are taken from the Revised Version, but occasionally for purposes of the argument it was necessary to give another translation. Old Testament quotations are usually according to the Septuagint, but sometimes it was desirable to give a translation of the Hebrew, and then, unless the argument seemed to require a different rendering, the Revised Version is quoted. The writer wishes to express his thanks to the University Presses of Oxford

and Cambridge for permission kindly given to use this version where suitable, and he accepts entire responsibility for all deviations from it.

W. LOCKTON.

WINCHESTER DIOCESAN TRAINING COLLEGE,
St. Matthew's Day, 1926.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE EXISTENCE OF DIFFERENT TRADITIONS	1
II.	THE THREE LINES OF TRADITION	19
III.	THE TRADITIONS OF PETER, JAMES, AND JOHN	42
IV.	THE PRIMITIVE GOSPEL STORY	73
V.	SOME ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE HYPOTHESIS	96
VI.	THE ANOINTING OF JESUS	116
VII.	THE LAST SUPPER	131
VIII.	THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST	149
IX.	THE ARREST OF JESUS	172
X.	IN THE HIGH PRIEST'S PALACE	183
XI.	THE DENIALS OF PETER	230
XII.	THE MOCKING IN THE PRÆTORIUM	245
XIII.	THE DEATH OF JESUS	274

Καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομενῇ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων
κατὰ πόλεις ἡ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ
συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα
τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν
προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ.

JUSTIN MARTYR, *Apologia I*, lxxvii, 8.

THE THREE TRADITIONS IN THE GOSPELS

CHAPTER I

THE EXISTENCE OF DIFFERENT TRADITIONS

IT is commonly agreed that the gospels are compiled of material drawn from several sources, which record different traditions with regard to the life of Jesus, and that the three Synoptic gospels, at any rate, cannot be considered independent one of another. It is not the primary purpose of this essay to prove the priority or dependence of any of the gospels, and it will deal rather with traditions than with individual gospels. Yet it may be well at the outset to give an indication, without proof, of certain conclusions with respect to the origin of the gospels, which will receive continual confirmation as the essay proceeds, though to set out all the evidence would require a very large book.

Mark, there are reasons to believe, is a compilation from three separate lines of tradition, two of which are used in Luke, generally in an earlier stage of development, and Matthew is an edited version of Mark with the addition of other material, especially from one of the primary traditions.

Luke says, for example: ‘As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make ye ready the way of the Lord, Make his paths straight’ (iii. 4; cf. Is. xl. 3). In quite another context we read: ‘This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, Who shall prepare thy way before thee’ (vii. 27; cf. Mal. iii. 1). Mark gives a combination of the two. ‘Even as it is written in Isaiah the prophet, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, Who shall prepare thy way; The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make ye ready the way of the Lord, Make his paths straight’ (i. 2–3). We notice that a prophecy of Malachi is attributed to Isaiah, one of the somewhat numerous inaccuracies to be found in the second gospel.

Again Luke says in two quite distinct contexts: ‘Then let them that are in Judæa flee unto the mountains; and let them that

are in the midst of her depart out ; and let not them that are in the country enter therein' (xxi. 21). ' In that day, he which shall be on the housetop, and his goods in the house, let him not go down to take them away' (xvii. 31). Mark conflates the two passages. ' Then let them that are in Judæa flee unto the mountains : and let him that is on the housetop not go down, nor enter in, to take anything out of his house ' (xiii. 14-15). Two really contradictory traditions are thus combined. Very many examples of similar conflation might be quoted. Some we shall have to discuss later in this essay.

The sequence, Luke, Mark, Matthew, shews a continuous and frequently very striking development of tradition. We may illustrate it by the accounts of the stone and angels at the sepulchre. Luke says : ' And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, while they were perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in dazzling apparel : and . . . they were affrighted, and bowed down their faces to the earth ' (xxiv. 2-5). Mark says : ' And they were saying among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb ? and

looking up, they see that the stone is rolled back : for it was exceeding great. And entering into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe ; and they were amazed ' (xvi. 3-5). Matthew says : ' And behold, there was a great earthquake ; for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone, and sat upon it. His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow : and for fear of him the watchers did quake, and became as dead men ' (xxviii. 2-4). In the three stages the story has changed almost beyond recognition.

Numerous instances of a similar character might be adduced. Several we must quote at a later point in the argument. Sometimes the Synoptic gospels provide us with no fewer than five different stages in the development of a saying. In Luke xii. we read : ' And when they bring you before the synagogues, and the rulers, and the authorities . . .' (xii. 11). In Luke xxi. it has become, ' They shall lay their hands on you, and shall persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and prisons, bringing you before kings and governors for my name's sake. It shall turn unto you for a testimony ' (xxi. 12-13). At the other stages it will perhaps be sufficient

to quote the equivalent of the last sentence, which is absent from the earliest version of the saying. In Matthew x. it has become, ‘For a testimony to them and to the Gentiles’ (x. 18). In Mark we read: ‘For a testimony unto them. And the gospel must first be preached unto all the Gentiles’ (xiii. 9–10). In Matthew xxiv. we read: ‘And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the Gentiles’ (xxiv. 14). The growth of the saying is most remarkable, and apart from the intermediate stages it would be almost impossible to recognise the connexion between the first and last versions of it.

A consideration of the various doublets in the gospels will help us to distinguish the different traditions. At the conclusion of our Lord’s explanation of the parable of the sower we read in Luke: ‘And no man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but putteth it on a stand, that they which enter in may see the light. For nothing is hid, that shall not be made manifest; nor anything secret, that shall not be known and come to light. Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him

shall be taken away even that which he thinketh he hath' (viii. 16–18). Much of this appears also elsewhere in Luke. 'No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, putteth it in a cellar, neither under the bushel, but on the stand, that they which enter in may see the light' (xi. 33). 'But there is nothing covered up, that shall not be revealed : and hid, that shall not be known' (xii. 2). 'I say unto you, that unto every one that hath shall be given ; but from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away from him' (xix. 26). Only one sentence, we notice, has no parallel elsewhere in the gospel, 'Take heed therefore how ye hear,' and this, we find, if we omit the passages which appear also in another context, fits on admirably at the end of the explanation of the parable. We then read; 'Now the parable is this : The seed is the word of God. And those by the way side are they that have heard ; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word from their heart, that they may not believe and be saved. And those on the rock are they which, when they have heard, receive the word with joy ; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away. And that which fell among the thorns, these are they

that have heard, and as they go on their way they are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection. And that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit with patience. Take heed therefore how ye hear' (viii. 11-15, 18). We cannot well doubt that this is a more original form of the passage. Mark has changed this final warning so as to read, 'Take heed what ye hear' (iv. 24), the connexion with the explanation of the parable thus entirely disappearing. Mark has also added further interpolations, 'If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear. And he saith unto them . . . With what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you: and more shall be given unto you' (iv. 23-24), drawn from other contexts in Luke. 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear' (xiv. 35; cf. viii. 8), 'For with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again' (vi. 38), 'And these things shall be added unto you' (xii. 31). A comparison of Mark with Luke, we see, shews the process of interpolation from one tradition in the other, which had begun in Luke, still at work.

Another example may be found in the

collection of sayings which follows our Lord's first prediction of His passion and resurrection. We read in Luke: ' And he said unto all, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it ; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self ? For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory, and the glory of the Father, and of the holy angels ' (ix. 23-26). We note parallels in other contexts in Luke : ' Whosoever doth not bear his own cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. . . . So therefore whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple ' (xiv. 27, 33), ' Whosoever shall seek to gain his life shall lose it : but whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it ' (xvii. 33), ' And I say unto you, Every one who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God : but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God ' (xii. 8-9). The hand of an editor is apparent in the

sayings as they appear in Luke ix. 23–26, but only one verse is without a parallel elsewhere in the gospel. This verse was evidently suggested by a saying in the Apocalypse of Baruch, ‘For what then have men lost their life? . . . For . . . they denied the world’ (li. 15–16),¹ and so it differs from the other verses of the collection of sayings only in its source. If we omit the verses which have parallels elsewhere, what is left makes excellent sense, the proper meaning of the verse which follows coming out for the first time. ‘But he charged them, and commanded them to tell this to no man ; saying, The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up. And I tell you of a truth, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God’ (ix. 21–22, 27). It seems certain that we have here a more original version of the saying, as it stood before interpolation. Mark repeats the same interpolated collection of sayings with a few editorial changes, omitting ‘daily’ and ‘his own glory,’ and adding ‘and the gospel’s’ and ‘in this adulterous and sinful generation,’

¹ Eng. trans. Charles (S.P.C.K.).

the chief alteration being that he continues the excerpt from the Apocalypse of Baruch in a more exact and fuller form, 'For what should a man give in exchange for his soul?' (viii. 37), 'And for what have those who were on the earth exchanged their soul?' (li. 15). Again a comparison of Mark and Luke shews the process of interpolation at work.

The most important example of development by accretion, and the influence of one tradition upon another is to be found in the great apocalyptic discourse, which to the original nucleus of Luke xxi. adds the apocalyptic discourse of Luke xvii. modified and expanded by sayings from the Old Testament and elsewhere almost beyond recognition. To trace out the equivalence of the two discourses is far too long to attempt here,¹ but the result, which enables us to identify the original form of the narrative, in Luke xxi., is particularly interesting. 'And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and offerings, he said, As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in which there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And they asked him, saying, Master, when therefore

¹ See *The Parousia* by the present writer, in preparation.

shall these things be ? and what shall be the sign when these things are about to come to pass ? And he said, When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand. And he spake to them a parable : Behold the fig tree, and all the trees : when they now shoot forth, ye see it and know of your own selves that the summer is now nigh. Even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh' (xxi. 5-8, 20, 29-31). Luke combines the original incident of chapter xxi. with a developed version of the apocalyptic discourse of chapter xvii. Mark conflates the narrative thus compiled with certain features of the same apocalyptic discourse in a less developed form, while Matthew goes still further and combines Mark's narrative with large portions of the same discourse in practically its original text, with the result that at least one saying of our Lord appears in Matthew in three different versions (Luke xvii. 23 = Matt. xxiv. 5 = xxiv. 23 = xxiv. 26), as a consequence of three successive interpolations in a context which properly contains none of them.

So far we have illustrated the influence of one line of tradition upon another ex-

clusively from Luke. Mark however supplies us with many examples of the same thing. The story of the visit of our Lord's relatives is particularly interesting in this way, also because it provides an instance of Mark retaining material belonging to Luke's primary tradition which Luke himself has discarded without giving the equivalent from his second line of tradition. Into the middle of the narrative the evangelist has interpolated the saying about Satan casting out Satan (Mark iii. 22b-27 = Luke xi. 15, 17-18a, 21-22), and also the saying about blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Mark iii. 28-29 = Luke xii. 10). The addition of the former was evidently suggested by the similarity of the accusations, 'He hath Beelzebub,' and 'By the prince of the devils casteth he out devils,' and that of the latter by the blasphemy of saying 'He hath Beelzebub,' the evangelist himself giving this reason for it, 'because they said, He hath an unclean spirit,' adapting our Lord's own words as given in Luke, 'because ye say that I cast out devils by Beelzebub.' Omitting the interpolations we read: 'And he cometh into a house. And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread. And when his friends heard it, they

went out to lay hold on him : for people said, He is beside himself. And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub. And there come his mother and his brethren ; and, standing without, they sent unto him, calling him ' (iii. 19–22a, 31). It is curious to notice how Matthew continues the process of interpolation, inserting Luke's version of the saying about blasphemy against the Holy Ghost immediately after the version drawn from Mark, thus producing a doublet in two successive verses (xii. 31–32).

A list of all the passages where Mark augments one tradition by material taken from the other would be quite lengthy, but it may be drawn up without much difficulty by noticing where matter found in Mark appears in Luke, and in particular where statements or sayings found in combination in the former are widely separated in the latter, though caution is necessary, for sometimes passages belonging to the same, not to a different line of tradition, are conflated in the second gospel. One of the most striking instances of the combination of different traditions is the insertion of the incident of the lawyer's question at the end of the account of the Sadducees' question about the woman with seven husbands. We read in

Luke: ‘And certain of the scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said. For they durst not any more ask him any question’ (xx. 39–40). In quite another context we read: ‘And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live’ (x. 25–28). In Mark we have a palpable combination of the two. ‘And one of the scribes came, and heard them questioning together, and knowing that he had answered them well, asked him, What commandment is the first of all? Jesus answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God, the Lord is one: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him, Of a truth, Master, thou hast well said

that he is one ; and there is none other but he : and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. And no man after that durst ask him any question' (xii. 28-34). It is surely obvious that the Judaised narrative of Mark is secondary, and that the two commandments ought not properly to be ascribed to our Lord at all as commandments of the gospel. He merely assented to the lawyer's statement that they are an excellent summary of the law. We notice that Matthew makes the interpolation still greater, including within it the incident of our Lord's question about the Son of David, and concluding 'Neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions' (xxii. 46), words used by Mark after the question of the scribe, but in Luke after the question of the Sadducees.

It seems plain that we have in Luke, but also in Mark and Matthew, two distinct traditions, and that one is constantly being drawn upon for interpretative additions to the other. Sometimes the two lines of

tradition included different accounts of the same event, and in a few instances both are given in Luke; for example the mission of the seventy (x. 1-12) would appear to be another account of the mission of the twelve (ix. 1-5). Not infrequently the two traditions manifest themselves by the appearance of different accounts of the same incident in different gospels. We notice two quite distinct accounts of the work of John the Baptist (Mark i. 4-6; Luke iii. 1-17), though one has been augmented from the other (Mark i. 2-3 = Luke iii. 4 with vii. 27; Mark i. 7-8 = Luke iii. 16), Matthew making a further combination of the narratives of Mark and Luke (Matt. iii. 4, 5a, 6 = Mark i. 6, 5; Matt. iii. 5b = Luke iii. 3a; Matt. iii. 7-10 = Luke iii. 7-9; Matt. iii. 11 = Luke iii. 16 = Mark i. 7-8; Matt. iii. 12 = Luke iii. 17). Similarly we have two accounts of our Lord's temptation (Mark i. 12-13; Luke iv. 1-13), Matthew again combining the narratives of Mark and Luke (Matt. iv. 1-2a = Mark i. 12-13a = Luke iv. 1-2a; Matt. iv. 2b-11a = Luke iv. 2b-4, 9-12, 5-8, 13; Matt. iv. 11b = Mark i. 13b). Luke has an account of the call of Peter with James and John (v. 1-11), but Mark of Peter and Andrew, and then of James and John (i. 16-20), each of these

narratives being modelled on that of the call of Levi (Luke v. 27–28 = Mark ii. 13–14), and so apparently drawn from the same source, Matthew (iv. 18–22) repeating Mark. Luke again gives one account of our Lord's visit to Nazareth (iv. 16–30), but Mark a shorter and largely different account (vi. 1–6a), Matthew (xiii. 53–58) again reproducing Mark. Luke also gives one account of the prediction of Peter's denial (xxii. 31–34), but Mark (xiv. 27–31), followed by Matthew (xxvi. 31–35), another. Various other passages in Luke and Mark of smaller importance, parallel in substance yet shewing no signs of direct literary connexion, might also be quoted.

Mark, we see, frequently combines elements of the two traditions in Luke, sometimes he gives an account of an incident according to one tradition only where Luke gives the accounts from each of the two traditions, and sometimes he gives the story according to one tradition but Luke from another. It seems therefore not unreasonable to suppose that sometimes elsewhere, particularly when expanding Luke, he is utilising material from the source of the second line of tradition in Luke even though the particular incident or saying does not appear in that portion of the

tradition incorporated in the third gospel. Mark nearly always expands Luke, but frequently the expansion is of such a character that it cannot adequately be explained as the result of merely interpretative or editorial addition. New information is often apparent. In some cases, where the second tradition has survived, the source of this material, as we have seen, is obvious, and there seems no reason to postulate a different origin in cases where Luke has not thought fit to record it. We conclude therefore that Mark is a combination or conflation of two chief traditions, one of which provides the main outline of Luke, the other being utilised in a less degree though still largely. Luke as a rule makes a choice between different accounts of the same incident, or at any rate keeps them separate, whereas Mark combines the two into one narrative.

CHAPTER II

THE THREE LINES OF TRADITION

WE now turn to a consideration of the section of Mark, vi. 45 to viii. 26, which is not recorded in Luke, or in the case of a few passages in a different context. First of all we must examine the story of the feeding of the four thousand. We notice at once an extraordinary resemblance between this narrative and that of the feeding of the five thousand, and only if we consider the accounts of the feeding of the five thousand as well as those of the feeding of the four thousand can we find a solution of the problem involved.

If we compare the accounts of the feeding of the five thousand as given in Mark (vi. 30–44) and Luke (ix. 10–17) we notice that to a large extent they are identical,¹ as indeed we should expect from what we find in other parts of the two gospels. It will be useful to

¹ In this and later comparisons it has not, as a rule, been thought worth while to draw attention to the cases where different Greek words are represented by the same word in English, the meaning being the same. See a Greek synopsis.

set out the points of agreement between the two. We note : ‘ And the apostles . . . told him all things, whatsoever they had done,’ ‘ And the apostles . . . declared unto him whatsoever things they had done’ ; ‘ And they went away . . . apart,’ ‘ And he took them . . . apart’ ; ‘ and many knew it,’ ‘ But the multitudes knew it ’ ; ‘ a great multitude,’ ‘ the multitudes’ ; ‘ his disciples came unto him, and said,’ ‘ and the twelve came, and said unto him ’ ; ‘ send them away,’ ‘ Send the multitude away ’ ; ‘ that they may go away into the country and villages round about,’ ‘ that they may go into the villages and country round about ’ ; ‘ But he . . . said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him,’ ‘ But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said ’ ; ‘ How many loaves . . . Five, and two fishes,’ ‘ five loaves and two fishes ’ ; ‘ And he commanded them that all should sit down,’ ‘ And they . . . made them all sit down ’ ; ‘ by fifties,’ ‘ about fifty each ’ ; ‘ And he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake the loaves ; and he gave to the disciples to set before them,’ ‘ And he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them, and brake ; and gave to the

disciples to set before the multitude' ; ' And they did all eat, and were filled,' ' And they did eat, and were all filled' ; ' And they took up broken pieces, twelve basketfuls,' ' and there was taken up . . . of broken pieces, twelve baskets' ; ' And they . . . were five thousand men,' ' For they were about five thousand men.'

A comparison of Mark's two stories of the feeding of the five thousand (vi. 34-45) and of the feeding of the four thousand (viii. 1-10) likewise shews much verbal agreement. We notice in particular 'a great multitude,' 'a great multitude' ; ' he had compassion on them, because they . . . , ' ' I have compassion on the multitude, because they . . . ' ; ' And . . . his disciples came unto him, and said,' ' And his disciples answered him' ; ' The place is desert,' ' in a desert place' ; ' send them away,' ' if I send them away' ; ' And he saith unto them, How many loaves have ye ? . . . And . . . they say, Five,' ' And he asked them, How many loaves have ye ? And they said, Seven' ; ' And he commanded them that all should sit down . . . upon the green grass,' ' And he commandeth the multitude to sit down on the ground' ; ' And he took the five loaves,' ' and he took the seven loaves' ; ' and he brake the loaves ;

and he gave to the disciples to set before them,' 'he brake, and gave to his disciples, to set before them'; 'And they did all eat, and were filled,' 'And they did eat, and were filled'; 'And they took up broken pieces,' 'and they took up, of broken pieces'; 'And they . . . were five thousand men,' 'And they were about four thousand'; 'And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat,' 'And straightway he entered into the boat with his disciples'; 'while he himself sendeth the multitude away,' 'and he sent them away.'

Giving full weight to these points of agreement, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that Mark's account of the feeding of the five thousand is a conflation of the account of the same miracle as preserved in Luke, and of the similar story of the feeding of the four thousand given in another context in Mark. If so, in view of the fact that Mark is largely a combination of the two traditions incorporated in Luke, the latter account would seem to belong to the same line of tradition as that to which we have assigned Luke's account of the visit to Nazareth, the mission of the seventy and other incidents and sayings in Luke, as well as some found elsewhere in Mark. The appearance of the

incident of the asking for a sign in this section of Mark (viii. 11–12), and in the second tradition recorded in Luke (xi. 16, 29–30) seems to put the matter almost beyond question. It appears to be by no means improbable therefore that other material besides the incidents of the feeding of the multitude and the request for a sign recorded in the section of Mark not represented in Luke, belongs to the same tradition, which is given, apparently, by no means in its entirety in Luke, allowance of course being made in each case for editorial modification of phraseology to suit the evangelist's own taste.

Yet a conflation of the story of the feeding of the five thousand as given in Luke with the story of the feeding of the four thousand in Mark, does not fully explain all the features of Mark's account of the feeding of the five thousand. The fourth gospel also has a description of the miracle (vi. 1–17), and Mark's account (vi. 32–45) has much in common with this. We note in particular, 'And they went away in the boat,' 'Jesus went away to the other side of the sea'; 'a great multitude,' 'a great multitude'; 'his disciples came unto him, and said,' 'One of his disciples . . . saith unto him'; 'and buy themselves something they may eat,'

'are we to buy bread that these may eat'; 'he answered and said unto them,' 'Philip answered him'; 'two hundred pennyworth of bread,' 'Two hundred pennyworth of bread'; 'How many loaves have ye?' 'which hath five . . . loaves'; 'Five, and two fishes,' 'five barley loaves, and two fishes'; 'upon the green grass,' 'there was much grass'; 'And they sat down,' 'the men sat down'; 'And he took the five loaves,' 'Jesus . . . took the loaves'; 'And they took up broken pieces, twelve basketfuls,' 'So they . . . filled twelve baskets with broken pieces'; 'five thousand men,' 'the men . . . in number about five thousand'; 'And . . . he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat,' 'And . . . his disciples . . . entered into a boat'; 'unto the other side,' 'to the other side of the sea.' The similarity of the phraseology in so many details, and particularly the mention of the 'two hundred pennyworth of bread' and the 'grass' in both narratives, suggests a literary connexion, and that Mark is conflating not only the accounts of the feeding of the five thousand as given in Luke, and of the four thousand given elsewhere in Mark, but also the account of the feeding of the five thousand in John.

After the stories of the miraculous feeding both of the five thousand and of the four thousand we are told of a voyage across the lake. In the case of the feeding of the four thousand we read also of a second outward journey. In Mark's description of this later voyage we read: 'Do ye not yet perceive, neither understand ? have ye your heart hardened ? . . . When I brake the five loaves among the five thousand, how many baskets full of broken pieces took ye up ' (viii. 17, 19), 'And they come unto Bethsaida ' (viii. 22). In the description of the return journey after the feeding of the five thousand we note, 'to go . . . to Bethsaida ' (vi. 45), 'for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened' (vi. 52). Details belonging properly to the later voyage, we notice, have been inserted into the description of the backward journey regardless of the geographical fact that 'to go . . . unto the other side to Bethsaida ' (vi. 45) contradicts the later statement that 'when they had crossed over, they came to the land unto Gennesaret ' (vi. 53). We notice also other points of agreement between the two sections of Mark. 'And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat,' 'And straightway he entered into the boat with

his disciples'; 'to enter into the boat, and to go . . . unto the other side,' 'entering into the boat departed to the other side'; 'he himself sendeth the multitude away,' 'he sent them away'; 'And . . . they came to the land unto Gennesaret,' 'and came into the parts of Dalmanutha.' It seems to emerge that the description of the voyage after the feeding of the five thousand in Mark is a conflation of the accounts of the two voyages, the backward and outward journeys, after the feeding of the four thousand. Luke says that before the feeding of the five thousand Jesus 'withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida' (ix. 10), which agrees with John's statement that 'Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee' (vi. 1), and with what we are told in Mark was the result of the second crossing of the lake after the miracle, that 'they come unto Bethsaida' (viii. 22). Mark omits Luke's statement that the journey before the miracle was 'to a city called Bethsaida,' because of his inaccurate statement later, the result of combining the backward and outward voyages across the lake, that immediately after the feeding of the multitude they returned 'unto the other side to Bethsaida.' The problem afforded by the discrepancy between Mark and John is thus,

it would seem, completely solved. It is noteworthy that the statements that the voyage was ‘to Bethsaida’ (vi. 45), and that the disciples ‘understood not’ because ‘their heart was hardened’ (vi. 52), are absent from Matthew.

It will be useful to compare the two accounts of the second and fourth gospel of the voyage after the feeding of the five thousand. In Mark we read : ‘ And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before him unto the other side to Bethsaida, while he himself sendeth the multitude away. And after he had taken leave of them, he departed into the mountain to pray. And when even was come, the boat was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land. And seeing them distressed in rowing, for the wind was contrary unto them, about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking on the sea ; and he would have passed by them : but they, when they saw him walking on the sea, supposed that it was an apparition, and cried out: for they all saw him, and were troubled. But he straightway spake with them, and saith unto them, Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid. And he went up unto them into the boat ; and the wind ceased : and they were sore

amazed in themselves ; for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened. And when they had crossed over, they came to the land unto Gennesaret, and moored to the shore' (vi. 45-53). In John we read : 'Jesus therefore . . . withdrew again into the mountain himself alone. And when evening came, his disciples went down unto the sea ; and they entered into a boat, and were going over the sea unto Capernaum. And it was now dark, and Jesus had not yet come to them. And the sea was rising by reason of a great wind that blew. When therefore they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they behold Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the boat : and they were afraid. But he saith unto them, It is I; be not afraid. They were willing therefore to receive him into the boat : and straightway the boat was at the land whither they were going' (vi. 15-21).

Removing the elements which are drawn from the accounts of the two voyages after the feeding of the four thousand, which the evangelist has conflated, we notice how closely the rest of the story in Mark agrees with what we find in John, the two narratives being to a large extent verbally identical.

The differences are easily accounted for, and in some cases are particularly interesting. ‘Constrained’ is a Lukian word (xiv. 23; cf. Acts xxvi. 11, xxviii. 19), and may have been suggested by its use in the third gospel, being found otherwise only in this context in Matthew (xiv. 22) in the gospels. ‘To go before’ is a favourite word of Mark, being used five times (vi. 45, x. 32, xi. 9, xiv. 28, xvi. 7), though only once in Luke (xviii. 39). To ‘take leave’ is Lukian (ix. 61, xiv. 33; Acts xviii. 18, 21), appearing nowhere else in Mark and not at all in Matthew or John, so that it may have been suggested by the third gospel, if a source is desired. ‘He departed into the mountain to pray’ agrees with John in the words ‘into the mountain.’ The statement as a whole is particularly Lukian. ‘He went out into the mountain to pray’ (vi. 12), ‘He went up into the mountain to pray’ (ix. 28), similar statements with the verb in the infinitive appearing also elsewhere (xviii. 10; Acts x. 9), though the form of words appears only in this context in the other Synoptic gospels (Mark vi. 46; Matt. xiv. 23). The phrases ‘distressed [tormented] in the rowing [driving],’ ‘that it was an apparition’ seem to be suggested by a description of the plagues on the Egyptians in

the book of Wisdom, ‘How their enemies were tormented’ (xvi. 4), ‘They were vexed [driven] with signs of apparitions’ (xvii. 15). We notice that in Matthew (xiv. 24, 26) the reference to the ‘rowing’ or ‘driving’ has disappeared, while the words, ‘It is an apparition,’ are put into the mouths of the disciples. ‘The wind was contrary’ is not found in any other context in the gospels, but in the plural it appears in Acts, ‘The winds were contrary’ (xxvii. 4), so that it was apparently a familiar expression (cf. Is. xvii. 13; Eccl. xxii. 18). ‘About the fourth watch of the night he cometh towards them . . . and he would have come to them’ is connected with ‘Jesus had not yet come towards them . . . they behold Jesus . . . drawing nigh’ of John, but the phraseology seems influenced by a passage in Luke, ‘He shall come [to them] and serve them. And if he shall come in the second watch, and if in the third . . . happy are they’ (xii. 37–38). As they were not ‘happy’ but ‘troubled,’ it could not have been in the second or third but must have been ‘about the fourth watch of the night,’ though the evangelist had only just stated that they were already ‘in the midst of the sea’ ‘when even was come,’ and John says that they set out ‘when evening came,’ even before ‘it

was now dark.' 'They cried out' is peculiar to Luke (iv. 33, viii. 28, xxiii. 18) and Mark (i. 23, vi. 49), occurring nowhere else in the New Testament. As the first of Mark's examples is derived from the tradition given in Luke, it is not improbable that the second is due to the same influence. 'Straightway' is characteristic of Mark, where it appears no fewer than forty times, though only seven times in Matthew, three times in John, once in Luke, and once in Acts, but nowhere else in the New Testament. 'He spake with them' is a combination of phraseology common in Mark. 'Be of good cheer, I . . .' is found not only in the parallel passage in Matthew (xiv. 27), but also in John (xvi. 33). In the singular the verb appears once in Mark (x. 49), and twice in Matthew (ix. 2, 22), and once in Acts (xxiii. 11). 'The wind ceased' occurs also earlier in Mark (iv. 39), and in the present context in Matthew (xiv. 32), but nowhere else in the New Testament. 'They were amazed' is a favourite expression of Mark (ii. 12, iii. 21, v. 42, vi. 51), and also of Luke (ii. 47, viii. 56, xxiv. 22; Acts ii. 7, 12, viii. 9, 11, 13, ix. 21, x. 45, xii. 16), occurring elsewhere in the New Testament only once in Matthew (xii. 23) and once in the second epistle to the Corinthians (v. 13).

‘They had crossed over’ is a word already used in Mark (v. 21). It occurs once in Luke (xvi. 26), once in Acts (xxi. 2), and twice in Matthew (ix. 1, xiv. 34), and except in Luke is always used of crossing the sea in a boat. ‘They moored to the shore’ is a word found nowhere else in biblical Greek, in either the New Testament or Septuagint.

Our examination of the words and phrases in Mark’s description of the voyage across the lake not found in John has shewn that none of them postulates another source. We have noticed the influence of the Septuagint, of passages in other contexts in Luke, and also of phraseology and even definite statements which appear elsewhere in Mark. All this suggests the hand of an editor but nothing more. We conclude then that Mark’s account of the voyage across the lake after the feeding of the five thousand is in part a conflation of the accounts of the two voyages, backward and again outward, after the feeding of the four thousand, likewise recorded in the present text of Mark, and in part of an edited and developed version of John’s account of the same voyage. The phraseology of Mark’s story of the feeding of the five thousand suggested what seems now to have been proved almost beyond question

that, in addition to material drawn from the two lines of tradition utilised by Luke, Mark has also used the tradition recorded in the fourth gospel. This conclusion is confirmed if we examine the various passages in the gospel where Mark has language in common with John, for generally where Mark agrees with John Luke has nothing, shewing that Mark has added matter from the Johannine tradition to the traditions recorded in Luke which form the basis of his gospel. We must examine some of these passages later. If it be correct that Mark used, even in a minor degree, the tradition recorded in the fourth gospel, it is plain that this tradition, whether expanded later or not, must have had its origin at a date earlier than Mark, and indeed, to judge from the way in which it is used in the second gospel, must have already existed as a definite body of tradition, if not in writing.

It seems clear that the conflation of the three traditions which we find in the bulk of Mark is not the work of the final editor of the gospel, but must have been taken over by him with the material which had come into his hands. Otherwise he would hardly have given the story of the feeding of the four thousand without realising that he had already described the same event as a feeding

of the five thousand, and for his description had borrowed part of his phraseology from this selfsame narrative of the feeding of the four thousand. We note that this large section of Mark not represented in Luke is not an interpretative addition to one tradition from another, like so many of the interpolations in Mark compared with Luke, but is a genuine piece of descriptive narrative in its proper place. According to Luke, Jesus crossed the lake to Bethsaida, and in the neighbourhood of this city the feeding of the five thousand took place. We are then given the story of Peter's confession. According to Mark, after the feeding of the four thousand Jesus crossed the lake to Dalmanutha, and then back again to Bethsaida, after which we are told of Peter's confession. In the parallel account in Mark telling of the feeding of the five thousand after the miracle there is a voyage to Bethsaida, which yet brings our Lord to Gennesaret, through a conflation, as we have seen, of two voyages in different directions. Clearly the account of Peter's confession ought to follow. Mark, or the final editor of the second gospel, evidently had before him two documents, that which is a conflation of three distinct lines of tradition, and one of these traditions, that which

Luke uses to augment the tradition which provides the main outline of his gospel, in its original form. The conflated narrative presumably contained none of the material which we now find between Mark vii. 1 and viii. 26, but proceeded from Mark vi. 56 to viii. 27 at once. The insertion was evidently made by the final editor because he found it in one of his two sources before the account of Peter's confession and thought it would be a valuable addition to the other source at that point, failing however to recognise that one of his two sources had already used elements of the other, so that his interpolation involved a repetition of much that he had already utilised in a slightly different form, in particular a repetition of the story of the feeding of the multitude and the crossing of the lake which followed.

Yet the inserted passage, Mark vii. 1 to viii. 26, is itself not without interpolations. In the account of the second voyage to Bethsaida we read: 'And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod' (viii. 15). It is clearly an interpretative addition from another context in the same tradition recorded in Luke, 'He began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the

leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy' (xii. 1). If the verse is omitted from Mark the sense is much improved. 'And they forgot to take bread; and they had not in the boat with them more than one loaf. And they reasoned one with another, saying, We have no bread' (viii. 14, 16). Yet in Matthew, where the Sadducees are mentioned and not Herod, we find that the question, 'Do ye not yet understand?' (Mark viii. 21), is interpreted at length in the light of the addition from the other context in Luke, 'How is it that ye do not perceive that I spake not to you concerning bread? But beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees' (xvi. 11-12).

Two other passages, the stories of the cure of the deaf man with the impediment in his speech (vii. 32-37), and of the blind man near some village (viii. 22b-26), appear to be interpolations. In outline the two accounts are almost identical, and they are evidently modelled on the same plan. Matthew, we note, gives neither. He omits also what in Mark seems to be the introduction to the story of the healing of the

blind man. ‘And they come unto Bethsaida’ (viii. 22a). He omits, however, all mention of Bethsaida, Luke’s statement that Jesus withdrew to Bethsaida before the feeding of the multitude (ix. 10), as well as Mark’s inaccurate statement that the voyage after the miracle was to Bethsaida (vi. 45), in addition to the present passage, presumably because he was aware that the statements were inconsistent, but had no means of correcting them. That the account of the healing of the blind man is an interpolation at the point is shewn further by internal evidence, for Bethsaida was something very much more than a ‘village’ at this period.

The story of the cure of the deaf man with an impediment in his speech seems to have been inserted as an illustration of the healing of the dumb. Mark says: ‘And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of Decapolis. And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and stammered [had an impediment in his speech]. . . . And his ears were opened, and the bond of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain. . . . And they were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well : he maketh even the deaf to

hear, and the dumb to speak' (vii. 31–32, 35, 37). Matthew says: 'And Jesus departed thence, and came nigh unto the sea of Galilee; and he went up into the mountain, and sat there. And there came unto him great multitudes, having with them the lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and they cast them down at his feet; and he healed them: insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, and the lame walking, and the blind seeing: and they glorified the God of Israel' (xv. 29–31). Both passages seem modified from an original which was based apparently on a prophecy of Isaiah, each evangelist editing in his own way the prophet's summary of the infirm made whole. 'Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall hear. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the stammerers shall speak plainly' (xxxv. 5–6). 'The God of Israel' is one of the titles of Jehovah in Isaiah (xli. 17, xlv. 3, xlvi. 2). The reference in Matthew apparently is not to the Septuagint, though Mark seems to have had it in mind when he illustrated the healing of the dumb by the account of a cure of a stammerer. The close resemblance which exists between

Matthew's introduction to the story of the feeding of the four thousand, and John's to his account of the feeding of the five thousand is very remarkable. We read in the fourth gospel : ' After these things Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias. And a great multitude followed him, because they beheld the signs which he did on them that were sick. And Jesus went up into the mountain, and there he sat with his disciples ' (vi. 1-3). The agreement between the two accounts suggests that they are traceable to a common original rather than that one has influenced the other, and, if so, at this point Matthew, not Mark, preserves the earlier form of the Synoptic text, the story of the healing of the deaf man being an interpolation inserted apparently at a period subsequent to the use of the second gospel by the compiler of the first.

The journey outlined by Mark after the account of the healing of the daughter of the Syrophoenician woman is very extraordinary. ' And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of Decapolis ' (vii. 31). That anyone journeying from Tyre to the sea of Galilee should pass through Sidon, going north in

order to reach a place in the south, no reason being assigned for such a detour, is almost inconceivable. In the corresponding accounts of John and Matthew only the sea of Galilee is mentioned. ‘From the borders of Tyre . . . through Sidon’ seems to be an echo of ‘into the borders of Tyre and Sidon’ in the introduction to the story of the Syro-phoenician woman, regardless of geography. The reference to ‘the borders of Decapolis,’ which takes the place in Mark of the statement in Matthew that Jesus went up into a mountain, is probably to be ascribed to an editor, ‘throughout the whole city’ of Luke (viii. 39) being changed to ‘in Decapolis’ in Mark (v. 20) in the account of the Gerasene demoniac. Otherwise the mention of Decapolis must belong to the story of the healing of the deaf man with the impediment in his speech, though it is improbable that a vague description like Decapolis would be given as the scene of a miracle rather than the name of a particular town. Elsewhere in the gospels Decapolis is mentioned only in a list of places in Matthew (iv. 25) from which great multitudes followed Jesus, where also probably it is an editorial addition.

Neither the incident of the cure of the deaf man with the impediment in his speech, nor

that of the healing of the blind man can be regarded, it would seem, as rightly placed in the context in which they are given in Mark. Yet the careful attention to details suggests that they belong to the same source. We note the similarity, particularly of the former, to the account of the healing of the two blind men in the house in the first gospel (ix. 27–31), which appears to be the equivalent in the second line of tradition of that of the healing of the blind man at Jericho in the first (Luke xviii. 35–43). Probably then, though out of position, they belong, like the warning about the leaven of the Pharisees (viii. 15), to the same source as the rest of Mark's interpolation, not to that used by him as the framework for the greater part of his gospel.

CHAPTER III

THE TRADITIONS OF PETER, JAMES, AND JOHN

WE have distinguished three separate traditions in the gospel story. Can we discover anything about their origin, or identify their authors ? At Capernaum we read : ‘ And he rose up from the synagogue, and entered into the house of Simon. And Simon’s wife’s mother was holden with a great fever ; and they besought him for her ’ (Luke iv. 38). The prominent figure is Peter, and it is quite natural that he should tell the story of his mother-in-law’s cure. When we notice that in Mark the incident is told from another point of view, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that Luke is giving Peter’s account of the incident.

Again, at the beginning of the list of the twelve apostles as recorded in Luke we read : ‘ Simon, whom he also named Peter, and Andrew his brother ’ (vi. 14). In Mark we read : ‘ And Simon he surnamed Peter . . .

and Andrew' (iii. 16, 18), the names and description of the sons of Zebedee being inserted between the name of Peter and that of his brother, who is indeed not described as such. The interest is in Peter in Luke's version of the list in a way which is not true in Mark's, Peter's prominence suggesting that the particular line of tradition which thus makes him central is ultimately traceable to him.

In the account of the healing of the woman who had the issue of blood we read in Luke: 'And Jesus said, Who is it that touched me? And when all denied, Peter said, and they that were with him, Master, the multitudes press thee and crush thee' (viii. 45). Mark speaks only of 'his disciples' (v. 31). Whether 'and they that were with him' is authentic or not, Peter certainly appears as leader, and no one would be more likely to remember that it was he who tried to explain away the fact that the woman had touched Jesus' garment. Later when Jesus came to Jairus' house we are told 'he suffered not any man to enter in with him, save Peter, and John, and James' (viii. 51). The sequence 'Peter, and John,' appears also in Luke's story of the transfiguration (ix. 28), and of the sending of the disciples to prepare

the passover (xxii. 8). It appears too in Acts in the list of the apostles (i. 13), and six times in the account of the healing of the lame man at the gate of the temple and the events which followed (iii. 1, 3, 4, 11; iv. 13, 19), likewise also in the account of the first confirmation in Samaria (viii. 14). The account of the healing of the lame man must be ascribed to Peter or John, and if we examine it carefully the natural explanation is that it is derived from Peter. The central figure is Peter, and the story is told from his point of view. If we put the narrative into the first person with Peter as the speaker, we have a quite natural description, but if we try to imagine John as the speaker it is somewhat awkward. The events in Samaria likewise are described as they would appear to Peter, not to John. Peter and John were evidently both intimate friends and fellow workers, Peter however being much the more prominent. It is easy to imagine Peter when telling of his work making mention of John, but if we think of the account as given by John there is no reason why he should have mentioned himself at all, for no element of the narrative depends upon his presence.

In the story of the Transfiguration we read : 'He took with him Peter and John and James,

and went up into the mountain to pray. . . . Now Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep. . . . And it came to pass, as they were parting from him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah: not knowing what he said' (ix. 28, 32-33). Peter is beyond doubt the central figure of the story, John and James being merely 'they that were with him.' Even what is said of our Lord is only a record of what was seen and heard by another. Nothing is said of His own personal experience; yet the thoughts of Peter are given, 'not knowing what he said.' In Mark (ix. 2-8) Peter's prominence has largely disappeared, his friend John is separated from him, 'Peter, and James, and John,' and the other two apostles are no longer described as 'they that are with him,' the statement 'not knowing what he said' which reveals to us Peter's mind being replaced by 'For he wist not what to answer,' found also in the non-Lukan tradition of the events in Gethsemane (xiv. 40), these words giving merely the opinion of another person.

Of the confession of Peter we have two independent traditions. In Luke we read:

' And it came to pass, as he was praying alone, the disciples were with him : and he asked them, saying, Who do the multitudes say that I am ? And they answering said, John the Baptist ; but others say, Elijah ; and others, that one of the old prophets is risen again. And he said unto them, But who say ye that I am ? And Peter answering said, The Christ of God. But he charged them, and commanded them to tell this to no man ' (ix. 18-21). In John we read : ' Upon this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. Jesus said therefore unto the twelve, Would ye also go away ? Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go ? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God. Jesus answered them, Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil ? ' (vi. 66-70). In John the confession is incidental, but in Luke it is mentioned for its own sake. One person only would be likely to regard as of special importance a declaration of what had been the disciples' faith from the beginning. ' Andrew, Simon Peter's brother,' we are told, ' findeth first his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah ' (John i. 40-41). Philip had

said the same thing to Nathanael, ‘ We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph ’ (i. 45), and Nathanael had confessed it to Jesus, ‘ Rabbi, thou art the Son of God ; thou art king of Israel ’ (i. 49). Only Peter therefore would be likely to see in his confession an event of such central significance as it holds in Luke and the other Synoptic gospels, reflecting it would seem Peter’s own experience.

Again we read in Luke at the end of our Lord’s saying about those who have riches, ‘ And Peter said, Lo, we have left our own, and followed thee. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or wife, or brethren, or parents, or children, for the kingdom of God’s sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this time, and in the world to come eternal life ’ (xviii. 28–30). No one would be more likely to record this incident than Peter. ‘ We have left our own,’ ‘ that hath left . . . wife,’ are specially significant in his case. In Mark the first has become ‘ We have left all ’ (x. 28), and ‘ wife ’ is omitted, the special suitability to Peter’s case disappearing.

At the end of our Lord’s discourse after

the last supper according to Luke we read : ' Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat : but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not : and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren. And he said unto him, Lord, with thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death. And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, until thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me ' (xxii. 31-34). The record of a promise so personal and intimate is surely traceable to Peter himself. It is difficult to imagine it due to the recollection of another. In Mark the incident is related in much more general terms. ' And Jesus said unto them, All ye shall be offended : for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad. Howbeit, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee. But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be offended, yet will not I . . . If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee. And in like manner also said they all ' (xiv. 27-29, 31). The specially Petrine features have disappeared, mention being made of all.

After the arrest of Jesus Luke tells us : ' But Peter followed afar off. And when

they had kindled a fire in the midst of the court, and had sat down together, Peter sat in the midst of them' (xxii. 54-55). The story of his three denials follows. 'And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord' (xxii. 61). Only two disciples could give accounts of Peter's denials, Peter and 'the other disciple' mentioned in John. That it was the Lord's look which made Peter remember could only come from Peter himself. It is absent from Mark.

Much of Luke's chief source is thus most naturally ascribed to Peter, and for certain elements of it any other origin seems out of the question. We decide therefore that this line of tradition is traceable ultimately to Peter. Where in Mark another tradition has been substituted for that given in Luke, as in the story of the call of Peter and Andrew, James and John, and the visit to Nazareth, the brief and formal style suggests the same author. Much of the description of the call of Peter as given by Luke could only have been derived from Peter himself, in particular the incidents on Simon's boat. Yet as we have it the story seems to be told from the point of view of another. It reads very awkwardly if we put it into the first

person and make Simon the speaker. Although so prominent he is not really central, and the description is not his. It is very different in Mark's account. 'And passing along by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon casting a net in the sea: for they were fishers. And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men. And straightway they left the nets, and followed him. And going on a little further, he saw James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were in the boat mending the nets. And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired servants, and went after him' (i. 16-20). Peter here is quite central, and the account reads easily in the first person with Peter as the speaker. If we try to imagine Andrew, James, or John speaking we see how impossible it becomes. Andrew is mentioned as 'the brother of Simon,' but is ignored in Luke. The call of James and John is evidently of minor interest to the narrator. Zebedee is prominent, and there is a mention of 'the hired servants,' all quite natural if Peter be the speaker and the statement of the other story true that 'James and John, sons

of Zebedee . . . were partners with Simon' (Luke v. 10). We notice further how closely parallel the two accounts of the call of the two pairs of brothers are to that of the call of Levi in Luke, in the line of tradition we have concluded to be Petrine. ' And after these things he went forth, and beheld a publican, named Levi, sitting at the place of toll, and said unto him, Follow me. And he forsook all, and rose up, and followed him ' (v. 27-28). Our conclusion must be that in his description of the call of Peter and Andrew, James and John, Mark is using the Petrine tradition, which Luke here discards, preferring another. We have thus further confirmation of our identification of the two principal lines of tradition in Luke and Mark, suggesting that the method of discrimination is equally trustworthy where no similar test can be applied.

Can we identify the author of the second line of tradition employed in Luke? The mission of the seventy in this tradition we have decided is a doublet of the mission of the twelve in the other. The mission of the seventy, however, does not stand alone, but tells of the continuation of a policy adopted by our Lord in the case of a village in Samaria. ' And it came to pass, when the

days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face : and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. . . . Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come ' (ix. 51-52, x. 1). Two of the apostles come before us very prominently in connexion with the refusal of the Samaritans to receive our Lord, and from the incident they seem to have gained the name ' Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder ' (Mark iii. 17). ' And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he were going to Jerusalem. And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them ? But he turned and rebuked them. And they went to another village ' (ix. 53-56). That the story of their rebuke should have been recorded by James or John is much more probable than that we owe it to someone else. If so, the mission of the seventy would appear to be the account of James or John, while the mission of the twelve is Peter's version of the same incident.

We have already discussed the two accounts of the call of Peter and have decided that that in Mark is Peter's own. Luke's story is much fuller, a characteristic of the tradition from which, if our contention is correct, he has taken it. Though studiously kept in the background, there are other figures besides Peter who had an important part in what happened. 'They beckoned unto their partners in the other boat, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both the boats, so that they began to sink. But Simon Peter, when he saw it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was amazed, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken; and so were also James and John, sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; for henceforth thou shalt catch men. And when they had brought their boats to land, they left all, and followed him' (v. 7-11). We notice the reserve with regard to the part played by the partners. It is plainly unwillingness to make them prominent, not lack of interest as in the other tradition, which keeps them in the background. The suggestion is that as we

owe the other account to Peter, we owe this to James or John.

The two accounts of our Lord's visit to Nazareth afford no direct evidence of authorship, as no names of apostles or other disciples who might be regarded as originators of a tradition are mentioned. In each case, however, the style of the narrative is unmistakable, that in Mark clearly belonging to the same tradition as Mark's story of the call of Peter and Andrew, while that in Luke just as plainly belongs to the same source as Luke's story of the call of Peter. If so, we have the authorship of Peter in one case and that of James or John in the other.

The many additions which Mark has made to the Petrine narrative as it appears in Luke, which seem to be not merely editorial alterations but drawn from a parallel tradition, are particularly interesting. Luke says : ' And he rose up from the synagogue, and entered into the house of Simon ' (iv. 38). Mark says : ' And straightway, when they were come out of the synagogue, they came into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John ' (i. 29). Luke says, ' And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever ' (iv. 39), but Mark, ' And he came and took her by the hand, and raised her up ' (i. 31). In both

cases apparently Mark has information not in Luke, so that the addition cannot well be merely editorial. We seem to have additions derived from an eyewitness who must have been Andrew, James, or John, and from the different way in which they are mentioned probably one of the two last.

In Luke in the list of the twelve apostles we read : ‘Simon, whom he also named Peter, and Andrew his brother, and James and John’ (vi. 14). In Mark, where there is evidence of conflation with another tradition, we read : ‘And Simon he surnamed Peter ; and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James ; and them he surnamed Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder : and Andrew’ (iii. 16–18). In Luke Peter alone is the important person, James and John being merely names. In Mark it is very different. Peter is of less account, and Andrew is no longer mentioned as his brother. All the emphasis is put upon the sons of Zebedee. If Luke’s narrative be Peter’s, Mark’s must be derived, so far as these additions are concerned, from James or John. We notice that Mark has ‘Thaddæus’ (iii. 18) where Luke has ‘Judas the son of James’ (vi. 16). If the changes in Mark are traceable to a tradition derived from James or

John, we see why a confusing reference to another James is avoided.

In his account of the healing of the woman with the issue of blood and of the raising of the daughter of Jairus, Mark has much information not found in Luke, suggesting a parallel story by an eyewitness. We note the words of Jairus, 'I pray thee, that thou come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be made whole and live' (v. 23), the words of the woman, 'If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole' (v. 28), 'and she felt in her body that she was healed of her plague' (v. 29), '[Jesus] . . . turned him about in the crowd' (v. 30), 'And he looked round about to see her that had done this thing' (v. 32), 'knowing what had been done to her' (v. 33), 'And they come to the house of the ruler of the synagogue; and he beholdeth a tumult' (v. 38), 'Why make ye a tumult' (v. 39), 'having put them all forth, taketh . . . them that were with him, and goeth in where the child was' (v. 40), 'Talitha cumi' (v. 41), 'and walked' (v. 42). 'Peter, and John, and James' has become 'Peter, and James, and John the brother of James' (v. 37). An order of names which emphasises John's friendship with Peter, natural in the Petrine tradition,

has given place to one which emphasises the importance of James. The suggestion is that the additions to the Petrine tradition preserved in Luke are traceable to James.

The story of Peter's confession, as given in Luke, we decided is Peter's own. We notice that our Lord's rebuke of Peter is absent from Luke, being an addition of Mark. 'And he spake the saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But he turning about, and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind me, Satan : for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men' (viii. 32-33). At first sight it might seem that a rebuke of Peter would be recounted only by Peter himself, according to the argument used in dealing with the rebuke of James and John. The rebuke of Peter, however, was really for the benefit of the other disciples. 'But he turning about, and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter.' In the case of James and John we read only, 'But he turned, and rebuked them' (Luke ix. 55). We notice the close similarity of expression, and yet the important difference. The suggestion is that though in this case the rebuke is of Peter the narrator of both incidents is the same. The passage is indeed an inter-

polation in Mark. We have decided above that Luke ix. 27 is properly a continuation of the saying of ix. 22. If so, Mark ix. 1 is a continuation of the saying of Mark viii. 31. If the collection of sayings found in Luke ix. 23–26 and Mark viii. 34–38 is an interpolation, the same must be true of Mark viii. 32–33, which tells of the rebuke of Peter. Like the other insertions at the point it must be drawn from another tradition. Unlike them, however, there is no reason to suppose that it has been interpolated in an entirely alien context. Yet clearly it would be more suitably placed at the conclusion of our Lord's prophecy about His death and resurrection than in the middle of it, and therefore would be better after Mark ix. 1, and before the account of the Transfiguration, in which, we shall see, as in the story of the raising of Jairus's daughter, the influence of a tradition which tends to emphasise the importance of James is again apparent. Such transposition of material, however, is by no means uncommon in Mark, being found repeatedly in the narrative of the passion.

Mark's account of the Transfiguration is much less Petrine than Luke's; it is written to describe the experience not of one man but of three. 'Peter and John and James'

has become ‘Peter, and James, and John.’ There are constant references to the three not found in Luke; Jesus ‘bringeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves: and he was transfigured before them’ (ix. 2), where Luke contains no allusion to the apostles; ‘And there appeared unto them Elijah with Moses’ (ix. 4), where Luke has simply, ‘And behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elijah’ (ix. 30). ‘And suddenly looking round about, they saw no one any more, save Jesus only with themselves’ (ix. 8), takes the place of ‘Jesus was found alone.’ The expression ‘Peter and they that were with him’ has disappeared, while ‘not knowing what he said’ has been replaced by the less intimate statement, ‘For he wist not what to answer,’ which is repeated in the non-Petrine matter added in Mark to the account of the events in Gethsemane (xiv. 40). At the end of the description Luke says simply, ‘And they held their peace, and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen’ (ix. 36). Mark gives quite a long passage instead. ‘And as they were coming down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man should

have risen again from the dead. And they kept the saying, questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean. And they asked him, saying, The scribes say that Elijah must first come. And he said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things : and how is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be set at nought ? But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him ' (ix. 9-13). Mark clearly must have had another source at his disposal in addition to Luke. The various alterations and additions, including the increase in the importance of James and John and the decrease in that of Peter, cannot be explained as merely editorial, and the change from 'Peter and John and James' to 'Peter, and James, and John,' linking it with the same change in the story of the raising of Jairus's daughter, seems to suggest the identity of the source, the line of tradition already associated, as we have seen reason to believe, with the name of James.

Luke says nothing of the ambitious request of James and John. In Mark we read : 'And there come near unto him James

and John, the sons of Zebedee, saying unto him, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask of thee. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you ? And they said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory. . . . And when the ten heard it, they began to be moved with indignation concerning James and John' (x. 35-37, 41). Again we have the record of an incident not complimentary to the sons of Zebedee, and as we are told the rest of the apostles were absent, the account must come ultimately from James or John. It marked the beginning of an indignation which continued apparently for some time, the meaning of which only James and John would fully appreciate. It summarises their experience, so that we cannot regard the story as coming merely from those who reported the incident to the ten. The climax of the story Mark gives immediately, relating our Lord's discourse on those who would be great at this point instead of at the last supper, as in Luke, to which it properly belongs. Mark shews other signs of accretion, absent from Matthew, who thus again preserves an earlier form of tradition, 'Or to be baptized with the

baptism that I am baptized with' (x. 38), 'And with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized' (x. 39), being based upon, 'But I have a baptism to be baptized with,' belonging properly to a quite different context as recorded in Luke (xii. 50).

After our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of the temple we read in Luke: 'And they asked him, saying, Master, when therefore shall these things be?' (xxi. 7). In Mark we read: 'And as he sat on the mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately, Tell us, when shall these things be?' (xiii. 3-4). Evidently Mark is in possession of fuller information than is contained in Luke. The fact is apparent indeed even in the words leading up to the prophecy. Luke says: 'And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and offerings, he said' (xxi. 5); but Mark says: 'And as he went forth out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, behold, what manner of stones and what manner of buildings! And Jesus said unto him' (xiii. 1-2). The concise narrative of Luke at the point agrees exactly with that of the tradition we have seen reason to believe Petrine, while the fuller

style of Mark agrees with that of the other tradition utilised by Luke and to some extent by Mark. Mark is evidently expanding one tradition by phraseology from the other. If Luke's story is Peter's, the second line of tradition used by Mark must be derived from James, John or Andrew, who also were present, probably from James, who may perhaps be discovered in the background, as in the account of the call of Peter, and identified with him who is called 'one of his disciples.'

Luke's account of what took place in the garden of Gethsemane begins: 'And he came out, and went, as his custom was, unto the mount of Olives; and the disciples also followed him. And when he was at the place, he said unto them, Pray that ye enter not into temptation' (xxii. 39-40). Mark's account is very different. 'And they come unto a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith unto his disciples, Sit ye here, while I pray. And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and began to be greatly amazed, and sore troubled. And he saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death: abide ye here, and watch' (xiv. 32-34). Mark clearly has much information not found in Luke. Again Luke

says : ‘ And when he rose up from his prayer, he came unto the disciples, and found them sleeping for sorrow, and said unto them, Why sleep ye ? ’ (xxii. 45–46). Mark says : ‘ And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon sleepest thou ? couldest thou not watch one hour ? ’ (xiv. 37). He could not have gathered from the tradition recorded in Luke that it was Peter in particular whom our Lord addressed. Again Mark must have had access to other information, apparently another source. The lengthy passage describing our Lord’s repeated prayer, and His return a second and third time to the disciples, belongs to a tradition of which Luke presumably knew nothing. Only an eyewitness could have supplied the information, if authentic. If Luke’s account be Peter’s, as is probable on general grounds and also because of the conciseness of narrative, manifest also elsewhere, and the omission of any suggestion that our Lord’s rebuke to the sleeping disciples was addressed specially to Peter, the additional information in Mark must be derived from James or John. We notice the statement, ‘ And they wist not what to answer him ’ (xiv. 40), linking the narrative with the Markan account of the Transfiguration, ‘ For

he wist not what to answer' (ix. 6), where we came to the same conclusion.

Describing the scene at the cross Luke says: 'And all his acquaintance, and the women that followed with him from Galilee, stood afar off, seeing these things' (xxiii. 49). Mark says: 'And there were also women beholding from afar: among whom were both Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome; who, when he was in Galilee, followed him, and ministered unto him; and many other women which came up with him unto Jerusalem' (xv. 40-41). Another passage in Luke must also be taken into consideration in discussing the origin of what we find in Mark. 'And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God, and with him the twelve, and certain women which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary that was called Magdalene, from whom seven devils had gone out, and Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto them of their substance' (viii. 1-3). The two passages of Luke account for most of what we find in Mark, but not for the names. Other

information must have been at the evangelist's disposal to account for these. We notice in particular 'Salome,' whom Matthew seems to identify with 'the mother of the sons of Zebedee' (xxvii. 56). Again we have an indication of a source connected with James and John. The description 'James the less' is thus not without significance, for it distinguishes him from James the son of Zebedee. After the burial Mark says, 'And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid' (xv. 47), where Luke has no names, 'And the women, which had come with him out of Galilee, followed after, and beheld the tomb, and how his body was laid' (xxiii. 55). We note the absence of Salome. According to the fourth gospel the beloved disciple took the mother of Jesus unto his own home before the death of Jesus (xix. 27). If he is to be identified with John the son of Zebedee it seems quite natural that his mother Salome would accompany them. There is thus a reason for the absence of Salome's name from the statement of those present at our Lord's burial, which otherwise is inexplicable. She is present again however, Mark tells us, on the Saturday evening at the purchase of spices, 'And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought

spices that they might come and anoint him' (xvi. 1). We notice a discrepancy between this statement and Luke's that they were already bought on Friday afternoon, 'And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments' (xxiii. 56). Speaking of the women who went to the sepulchre on Sunday morning, Luke says, 'Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James' (xxiv. 10). Mark clearly had information not to be found in Luke, apparently another tradition, with regard to what happened at the sepulchre on Good Friday and Easter Day, the statements of the two gospels sometimes being irreconcilable. The special interest in Salome suggests that this second tradition of Mark is connected with the sons of Zebedee.

Our investigation has brought out very many points on which the tradition used by Mark to augment the Petrine tradition recorded in Luke is traceable to James or John. In some instances the connexion seems to be beyond dispute, even if we regard merely the evidence afforded by a particular passage. The cumulative effect of all the additions would appear to be incontrovertible, that they are taken from a tradition which had its origin in James or John. The same result follows from a consideration of longer

passages ascribable to the same line of tradition, as the call of Peter and the mission of the seventy. In the Petrine tradition John as the friend and fellow worker of Peter is of more importance than James, and we read of 'Peter and John and James.' In this second line of tradition James is always mentioned before John, the order of Luke being changed in Mark in several contexts. There is thus no reason why we should suppose John rather than James the author of the tradition and very much which tells in the opposite direction. Evidence to be adduced later indeed will shew its absolute impossibility. Our conclusion therefore must be that as the main outline of the gospel of Luke is derived from a tradition having its origin in Peter, so the second line of tradition in Luke, which appears also in Mark in a smaller degree, frequently conflated with the former, and in Matthew, is traceable to James.

The third line of tradition utilised in Mark, as we have seen, though only in a comparatively few places, is that of the fourth gospel. According to this gospel first-hand reports of Peter's denial could come from two disciples only, Peter and 'the other disciple,' for these two alone followed Jesus into the palace of the high priest where the denials took place. As Peter's account is contained in Luke, that

in the fourth gospel must be that of ‘the other disciple.’ Mark’s account of the arrest, as we shall see, utilises the tradition preserved in the fourth gospel. As Peter, James, and John alone were in close proximity to Jesus, to one of these apparently, rather than to one of the disciples more distant, must be ascribed the detailed report of the incident given in the fourth gospel, and therefore the material drawn from this source in Mark. As the traditions which, according to our argument, are traceable to Peter and James are quite distinct from that recorded in the fourth gospel, the suggestion is that John is the author of this narrative. The presence of Salome at the cross and at the tomb on the first day of the week, but not at the burial, confirms this conclusion.

The account of the Transfiguration in Luke, if our argument is correct, must be ascribed to Peter, and that in Mark, to some extent at any rate, to James. Luke says: ‘The form of his countenance was altered, and his raiment became white and dazzling. . . . And . . . they saw his glory. . . . And a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my Son, my chosen’ (ix. 29, 32, 35). The Transfiguration was a mystical experience or ecstasy in which Jesus was manifested in the glory prophesied of the Child or Servant of

Jehovah, the reversal of his former humiliation, of which the second Isaiah speaks. Of the latter we read : 'Thy form shall be without glory from men, and thy glory from the sons of men. Thus shall many nations wonder at him . . . for . . . they shall see . . . He hath no form nor glory, and we saw him, but he had no form nor beauty . . . for his countenance was turned from us' (Is. lii. 14-15, liii. 2-3). Of the former we read : 'Behold, my servant shall . . . be glorified exceedingly. . . . The Lord also is pleased . . . to shew him light' (Is. lii. 13, liii. 10-11). The voice out of the cloud quotes another of the Servant passages, but from the Hebrew text, 'Behold my servant . . . my chosen' (xlii. 1). According to Mark the voice said, 'This is my son, my beloved' (ix. 7). In the Septuagint the two titles are almost synonymous, 'Fear not, my servant Jacob, and beloved Israel, whom I have chosen' (xliv. 2), while Matthew, in quoting Isaiah xlvi. 1, actually substitutes one title for the other, 'Behold, my servant whom I have chosen ; my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased' (xii. 18). In the fourth gospel we read : 'And the light shineth in the darkness ; and the darkness apprehended it not. . . . He came unto his own, and they that were his own

received him not. . . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth' (i. 5, 11, 14). 'Only begotten' and 'beloved' are used in the Septuagint to translate the same Hebrew word (Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 20, xxiv. (xxv.) 16, xxxiv. (xxxv.) 17; Gen. xxii. 2, 12, 16; Judges xi. 34; Jer. vi. 26; Amos viii. 10; Zech. xii. 10), and are therefore practically synonymous. The particular experience the writer of the fourth gospel had in mind—and the use of the aorist points to a definite occasion—was evidently the Transfiguration, and the Transfiguration as a reversal of the humiliation predicted of the Servant, the identification of Jesus with the Servant appearing also in the words of John the Baptist, 'Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (i. 29), in the same chapter. The phraseology, we see, is almost identical in the three passages. 'Thy glory . . . they shall see. . . . He hath no . . . glory, and we saw him,' 'They saw his glory,' 'We beheld his glory.' Only three apostles were witnesses of the Transfiguration—Peter, James, and John. Peter's account of what happened, so we have decided, is preserved in Luke, and James's, in part at any

rate, in Mark. The author of the fourth gospel says, ‘We beheld his glory,’ including himself among the beholders. He can therefore be identified only with John. There are, of course, many other arguments which tend to prove that the fourth gospel, or its source, is to be ascribed to John the son of Zebedee, but as they are in no way based on the existence of material from different lines of tradition in the gospels, they need not be repeated here.

Our investigation seems to have proved that the four gospels are compiled of material from three distinct lines of tradition, traceable to the three apostles, Peter, James, and John. The fourth gospel alone contains a simple tradition, that of John. Luke consists largely of narratives taken from the tradition of Peter, but with large blocks of matter drawn from the tradition of James. Mark also is based on the Petrine tradition, containing likewise much material derived from the Jacobean tradition, not however as a rule in big blocks, but as interpretative additions scattered throughout the Petrine narrative or conflated with it. In a smaller degree also it contains matter drawn from the tradition of John, preserved in its entirety in the fourth gospel.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRIMITIVE GOSPEL STORY

OF our Lord's temptation Luke says : ' And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness during forty days, being tempted of the devil. And he did eat nothing in those days : and when they were completed, he hungered ' (iv. 1-2). Mark says : ' And straightway the Spirit driveth him forth into the wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan ; and he was with the wild beasts ; and the angels ministered unto him ' (i. 12-13). In Deuteronomy we read : ' And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God hath led thee these forty years in the wilderness . . . to tempt thee. . . . And he suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna. . . . Who led thee through the great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents and scorpions . . . who fed thee in the wilderness with manna . . . that he might tempt thee ' (viii. 2-3,

15–16, Heb.). Luke's account is clearly based on the passage of Deuteronomy. We notice the 'leading,' 'in the wilderness,' 'forty days [years],' the temptation, 'hunger.' In Deuteronomy it is God who tempts, or proves; in Luke the devil. The same change is seen in the two accounts in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles of David's numbering of Israel. 'And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them, saying, Go, number Israel and Judah' (2 Sam. xxiv. 1, Heb.), 'And Satan stood up against Israel, and moved David to number Israel' (1 Chron. xxi. 1, Heb.). We note that in Luke there is no reference to the manna or the serpents. In the book of Wisdom we read: 'Even when terrible raging of wild beasts came upon thy people, and they were perishing by the bites of crooked serpents, thy wrath continued not to the uttermost' (xvi. 5), 'Thou gavest thy people angels' food to eat, and bread ready for their use didst thou provide for them from heaven without their toil' (xvi. 20). The manna and serpents of Deuteronomy, to which in Luke we find no reference, here appear as 'angels' food' and 'wild beasts.' We see thus the origin of Mark's statement, 'And he was with the wild beasts; and the angels

ministered unto him.' Both in Luke and in Mark the phraseology of the story of our Lord's sojourn in the wilderness is based upon that of the story of the wanderings of the children of Israel in the wilderness. The accounts of the two gospels are thus complementary, and both are necessary to bring out all the details of the comparison of the two stories. In Mark the connexion with Deuteronomy has almost disappeared, and it is plain that Mark's account is not adequately explained as based on Luke's. Both must be derived from a common original which gave all the details common to the experiences of our Lord and the children of Israel in the wilderness. The two gospel traditions of Peter and James are thus not entirely independent, but are the result of separate development from the same original, the primitive gospel story.

The accounts of our Lord's charge to the twelve in Luke and Mark, and of His charge to the seventy in Luke, give particularly interesting results when compared. Describing the mission of the twelve, Luke says : ' And he called the twelve together . . . and he sent them forth . . . and he said unto them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor wallet, nor bread, nor money ;

neither have two coats. And into whatsoever house ye enter, there abide, and thence depart' (ix. 1-4). Mark says : ' And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two . . . and he charged them that they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only ; no bread, no wallet, no money in their girdle ; but to go shod with sandals : and, said he, put not on two coats. And he said unto them, Wheresoever ye enter into a house, there abide till ye depart thence ' (vi. 7-10). Describing the mission of the seventy Luke says : ' Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come. And he said unto them, . . . Go your ways: . . . Carry no purse, no wallet, no shoes : and salute no man on the way. And into whatsoever house ye shall enter, first say, Peace to this house. And if a son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon him : but if not, it shall turn to you again. And in that same house remain ' (x. 1-7).

We notice the discrepancies between Mark's account and the other two, and particularly that in Mark a staff is allowed, but in Luke's charge to the twelve forbidden ; also

that Mark assumes a girdle which could be used as a purse, while in Luke's charge to the seventy a purse is forbidden. We compare certain passages in the story of Elisha's raising of the son of the Shunammite. ' And it came to pass, when Elisha saw her coming, that he said to Gehazi his servant, Behold now, that Shunammite : run now to meet her, and thou shalt say, Peace to thee, peace to thy husband, peace to the child. And she said, Peace. . . . And Elisha said to Gehazi, Gird up thy loins, and take my staff in thine hand, and go thy way : if thou meet any man thou shalt not salute him ; and if a man salute thee, thou shalt not answer him. . . . And Gehazi went on before her. . . . And Elisha entered into the house ' (4 (2) Kings iv. 25-26, 29, 31-32). There can be no doubt but that this story of Elisha has influenced the phraseology of the gospel narratives. Yet the Old Testament phrases appear not in one only of the New Testament accounts, but in the three, and particularly in Mark's charge to the twelve and Luke's charge to the seventy, different items in each. In Mark the staff is to be taken and a girdle worn, as in the order to Gehazi, though in Luke the first is forbidden in the charge to the twelve and the second (as a purse) in the

charge to the seventy. In the charge to the seventy in Luke we have the command to salute no man on the way, and to say 'Peace to this house,' agreeing exactly with the instructions to Gehazi. The seventy like Gehazi are to go on before. In all three accounts we have mention of entering into the house, which is prominent in the story of Elisha. It is plain that the comparison with the Old Testament story was a feature of an earlier form of the narrative which was the source from which the three different accounts as we have them in the gospels were derived. Mark's account, as usual, is a conflation of the traditions of Peter and James, Luke's account of the mission of the seventy being derived from the tradition of James alone. We have evidence therefore of the existence of this tradition of James in an earlier form than that which we now find in Luke, certain elements of this primitive narrative surviving in Mark and others in Luke.

Other details, which appear only in the different versions of the charge to the twelve, likewise help us to understand the process of development. We note the references to 'bread' (Luke ix. 3; Mark vi. 8) and 'sandals' (Mark vi. 9), and the injunction, 'Take

nothing for the journey' (Luke ix. 3; cf. Mark vi. 8), which seem to have been suggested by the story of the Gibeonites, in which also we find mention of 'bread' and 'sandals,' this word occurring only three times elsewhere in the Septuagint (Is. xx. 2; Judith x. 4, xvi. 9), and the instruction, 'Take to yourselves provision for the journey' (Josh. ix. 11 (5), 17 (11)). The command 'Neither have two coats' (Luke ix. 3; cf. Mark vi. 9) repeats the advice of the Baptist to the multitudes, 'He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none' (Luke iii. 11), and so is an example of the assimilation of one narrative, or tradition, to another.

We have noticed that Mark's account of the feeding of the five thousand is compiled from the traditions of the feeding of the five thousand recorded in Luke and John, and that of the feeding of the four thousand found in Mark, the traditions of Peter, James, and John being this combined. If we compare the Jacobean account in Mark (vii. 31–viii. 10) (with Matthew xv. 29–39) with the Petrine account in Luke (ix. 10–17) we find they have much in common. In both the healing of the sick is given as a reason for the presence of the multitudes. Various

phrases appear in both: 'if I send them away,' 'Send the multitude away'; 'here in a desert place,' 'here in a desert place'; 'and he took the seven loaves,' 'And he took the five loaves'; 'he brake, and gave to his disciples, to set before them; and they set them before the multitude,' 'and he brake, and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude'; 'And they did eat, and were filled,' 'And they did eat, and were all filled'; 'and they took up, of broken pieces that remained over,' 'and there was taken up that which remained over to them of broken pieces'; 'And they were about four thousand,' 'For they were about five thousand men.'

If we compare the Jacobean account with that in the fourth gospel (vi. 1-17) we likewise notice many points of resemblance, some of which have been already discussed. 'And Jesus departed thence, and came nigh unto the sea of Galilee,' 'After these things Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee'; 'and he went up into the mountain, and sat there,' 'And Jesus went up into the mountain, and there he sat'; 'And there came unto him great multitudes,' 'And a great multitude followed him'; 'and he healed them . . . they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, and the lame walking,

and the blind seeing,' 'they beheld the signs which he did on them that were sick'¹; 'a great multitude,' 'a great multitude'; 'And his disciples answered him,' 'Philip answered him'; 'Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread,' 'Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat'; 'he commandeth the multitude to sit down,' 'Make the people sit down'; 'and he took the seven loaves,' 'Jesus therefore took the loaves'; 'and having given thanks,' 'and having given thanks'; 'broken pieces that remained over,' 'the broken pieces which remain over'; 'they were about four thousand,' 'in number about five thousand'; 'he entered into the boat with his disciples,' 'his disciples . . . entered into a boat.'

A comparison of the Petrine account in Luke with the Johannine account of the fourth gospel shews also many details in common, 'the multitudes . . . followed him,' 'a great multitude followed him'; 'he spake to them of the kingdom of God,' 'they were about to come . . . to make him king'; 'them that had need of healing he healed,' 'the signs which he did on them that were sick'; 'Give ye them to eat,' 'that these

¹ Matthew xv. 29–31 is used for the first four clauses compared, afterwards Mark viii. 1–10. See pp. 38–39.

may eat'; 'five loaves and two fishes,' 'five barley loaves, and two fishes'; 'except we should go and buy food,' 'Whence are we to buy bread'; 'For they were about five thousand men,' 'So the men sat down, in number about five thousand'; 'And he said unto his disciples, Make them sit down,' 'Jesus said, Make the people sit down'; 'And he took the five loaves and the two fishes,' 'Jesus therefore took the loaves . . . likewise also of the fishes'; 'that which remained over to them of broken pieces,' 'the broken pieces which remain over'; 'of broken pieces, twelve baskets,' 'twelve baskets with broken pieces.'

It is plain from our comparison that the three primary accounts of the miracle are not really independent, but are merely different versions of an original narrative, the changes at any rate in part being due to the influence of passages to some extent similar in the Septuagint. The original form of the story indeed seems modelled upon an incident recorded of Elisha, though apart from an historical basis this could never have suggested it. 'And there came a man from Baal-shalishah, and brought the man of God bread of the first-fruits, twenty loaves of barley, and fresh ears of corn in his sack. And he said, Give unto the people, that they may eat. And his

servant said, What, should I set this before an hundred men ? But he said, Give the people, that they may eat ; for thus saith the Lord, They shall eat, and shall leave thereof. So he set it before them, and they did eat, and left thereof, according to the word of the Lord' (2 Kings iv. 42-44, Heb.). The 'barley loaves' reappear in the account of the feeding of the five thousand in the fourth gospel. 'Give the people, that they may eat' becomes 'Give ye them to eat' in the three Synoptic accounts of the same miracle. The objection of Elisha's servant that the supply of food is not sufficient is recorded of the apostles in varying forms in all the six accounts of the feeding of the multitudes in the gospels. The phrase 'he set it before them' is repeated in each of Mark's two accounts of miraculous feeding, 'to set before them ; and they set them before the multitude . . . to set these also before them,' 'to set before them,' and in Luke's account of the feeding of the five thousand, 'to set before the multitude.' 'They did eat' is found in each of the five Synoptic accounts of the feeding of a multitude, but not in John. The idea that they 'left thereof' appears in each of the six accounts in the gospels, where we read of the 'broken pieces that remained over' or

similar words. Comparison with the story of Elisha thus helps to confirm the view that the four accounts of the feeding of the five thousand, and the two accounts of the feeding of the four thousand, are derived from a common original.

On general principles derived from a comparison of the three traditions we should expect that that of James recorded in Mark is the most primitive, and this view is confirmed by an examination of the details of the different accounts of the miraculous feeding of the multitude. In this version of the narrative we have seven loaves and seven baskets. ‘Seven’ in both cases apparently should be interpreted as meaning ‘several’ according to a usage very common in the Old Testament in both the Hebrew and Septuagint, as ‘seven judgments’ (*Gen. iv. 15*), ‘seven times’ (*Gen. iv. 24; Lev. xxvi. 18, 24, 28; 4 (2) Kings iv. 35; Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 164; Prov. xxiv. 16*), ‘seven plagues’ (*Lev. xxvi. 21*), ‘seven ways’ (*Deut. xxviii. 7, 25*), ‘seven years’ (*Judges vi. 1; Ezek. xxxix. 9; Dan. iv. 13 (16), 23, 25, 29 (32), [30, 31, 32]*),¹ ‘seven sons’ (*Ruth iv. 15*), ‘seven children’ (*1 Kings (Sam.) ii. 5; Jer.*

¹ Italics—Hebrew only. Square brackets—Septuagint only, in *Ecclesiasticus* Hebrew text wanting.

xv. 9), ‘seven troubles’ (Job v. 19), ‘seven-fold’ (Ps. xi. (xii.) 6, lxxviii. (lxxix.) 12; Prov. vi. 31; Is. xxx. 26; Dan. iii. 19, [22]; Ecclus. vii. 3, [xx. 12], xxxii. (xxxv.) 11, [xl. 8]), ‘seven men’ (*Prov. xxvi. 16*), ‘seven abominations’ (Prov. xxvi. 25), ‘seven women’ (Is. iv. 1), ‘seven streams’ (Is. xi. 15), ‘seven days’ (Is. xxx. 26), ‘seven months’ (Ezek. xxxix. 12, 14), ‘seven watchmen’ (Ecclus. xxxvii. 14). In the gospels we note ‘seven spirits’ (Matt. xii. 45; Luke xi. 26), ‘seven times’ (Matt. xviii. 21, 22; Luke xvii. 4 *bis*), ‘seven devils’ (Luke viii. 2). ‘Several loaves’ would easily become ‘five loaves’ influenced by the incident of David at Nob, ‘if there are under thy hand five loaves, give . . . what is found’ (1 Kings (Sam.) xxi. 3). In Luke we read: ‘Give. . . . There are not to us more than five loaves’ (ix. 13). David is frequently called a lad—‘Thou art a lad’ (1 Kings (Sam.) xvii. 33), ‘He was a lad’ (xvii. 42), ‘Whose son art thou, lad?’ (xvii. 58)—and it was for his ‘lads’ (xxi. 2, 4, 5) that he wanted bread. We see then the allusion in the saying given in John, ‘There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves’ (vi. 9). The Jacobean account says: ‘They took up . . . seven baskets,’ but the Johannine, ‘They filled twelve

baskets.' The twelve baskets were of the type normally carried by the poorer Jews,¹ made of stout wicker work, and 'filled' means 'laded,' not necessarily that they became full. Each of the twelve apostles evidently used his own basket for the collection of the fragments, 'seven' or 'several baskets' of another type, probably larger, such as that which was used by St. Paul when escaping from Damascus (Acts ix. 25), being required to store them in readiness for future use. There is no necessary contradiction between the statements of the Jacobean and Johannine traditions. The Petrine account, as we have it in Luke, suggests that the twelve baskets were full, 'There was taken up that which remained over . . . twelve baskets' (ix. 17), while in the later versions of the tradition in Mark and Matthew it is actually stated, 'They took up . . . twelve basketfuls' (Mark vi. 43), 'They took up . . . twelve baskets full' (Matt. xiv. 20). Matthew also amplifies the Jacobean statement of Mark, 'They took up . . . seven baskets' (viii. 8), saying, 'They took up . . . seven baskets full' (xv. 37). We see the different lines of tradition developing before

¹ Juvenal, *Satirae*, iii. 14, vi. 542; cf. Judges vi. 19, Ps. lxxx. (lxxxi.) 6, and, in Aquila's translation, Gen. xl. 16.

our eyes, and find confirmation for our conclusions where the earlier stages have not survived.

The allusions to Old Testament incidents in the accounts of the feeding of the multitude are not only interesting in themselves but valuable as shewing the influences under which development of narrative occurs. The phrases 'lodge, and get victuals,' 'except we should go and buy food for all this people,' found in the Petrine story of the miracle in Luke, take us back to the story of Joseph and the famine, and must be regarded as interpretative additions, the Jacobean account in Mark having nothing to correspond. We notice 'where they lodged' (Gen. xlvi. 27), 'when we came to the lodging place' (xlvi. 21), the verb found in the gospel being used. The word translated 'victuals' which is found only thirteen times in the Septuagint appears twice in the narrative of Joseph, 'to give them victuals for the way' (xlvi. 25), 'and gave them victuals for the way' (xlvi. 21). Though the phrase 'get' or rather 'find food' does not appear, the verb 'get' or 'find' is frequent in the story of Joseph (xxxix. 4; xli. 38; xliv. 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 34; xlvi. 14, 25, 29; l. 4). The thought of going to buy food is common, providing

the basis for much of the narrative, the identical words of the gospel being employed, ‘Whence are ye come? . . . From the land of Canaan to buy food’ (xlvi. 7), ‘Go again, purchase us a little food’ (xlvi. 2), ‘We will go down and buy thee food. . . . We will not go’ (xlvi. 4–5), ‘to buy food’ (xlvi. 22), ‘Go again, and buy us a little food’ (xlvi. 25). Even the phrase ‘for all this people’ is repeated from Genesis, ‘All my people shall be obedient’ (xli. 40), ‘All the people cried to Pharaoh for bread’ (xli. 55), ‘He sold to all the people of the land’ (xlvi. 6).

The story of Joseph clearly supplied part of the background of the Petrine account of the feeding of the multitude. In the Johannine account a similar use is made of the story of Tobit. ‘In the feast of Pentecost . . . I sat down to eat. And I saw abundance of meat, and I said to my son, Go and bring what poor man soever thou shalt find of our brethren, who is mindful of the Lord’ (ii. 1–2). In the gospel we read: ‘Now the feast of the Jews was at hand, Jesus therefore . . . seeing that a great multitude cometh unto him, saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?’ (vi. 4–5). The idea of providing a feast because of the festival is

common to both. The Greek word for 'I sat down' is that used in the fourth gospel of the multitude (vi. 10), in Mark (vi. 40), copying John, but not in the Petrine tradition in Luke, and in the Jacobean tradition in Mark (viii. 6; cf. Matt. xv. 35). The Greek word for 'seeing' in John is that used for 'I saw' in Tobit, and that for 'great' the word in Tobit translated 'abundance of.' In the Sinaitic text instead of 'I saw abundance of meat' we read 'abundance of fishes was set before me.' The Greek word used here for 'fishes' is found nowhere else in the Septuagint, and in the New Testament only in the fourth gospel in the present context (vi. 9, 11) and in the epilogue (xxi. 9, 10, 13), while the word for 'set before' is that which appears in the accounts of the miracle in Luke (ix. 16) and Mark (vi. 41; viii. 6 *bis*, 7). We notice that Tobit's son is commonly called 'the lad' (v. 16; vi. 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 13). The incident of the fish forms an important feature of the story. 'And the lad went down to wash himself, and a fish leaped out of the river. . . . And the lad caught hold of the fish. . . . And they roasted the fish and did eat it' (vi. 2-3, 5). In the account in John the lad has not one fish but two. 'Two are better than one' (Eccles. iv. 9).

‘There is a lad here, which hath . . . two fishes.’ In the light then of stories in the Septuagint we understand both the five loaves and the two fishes. The Petrine as well as the Johannine tradition gives these details which are absent from the Jacobean. We seem thus to have evidence that the Petrine and Johannine traditions are derived from a common original at a later stage of development than that which the Jacobean represents, the allusions to the story of Joseph in the Petrine tradition suggesting that it is in this respect further developed than the Johannine.

In the Jacobean account of the feeding of the multitude we are told ‘They were about four thousand’ (Mark viii. 9), but in the Petrine, ‘They were about five thousand men’ (Luke ix. 14), while in the Johannine we read likewise, ‘So the men sat down, in number about five thousand’ (John vi. 10). As the word ‘about’ appears in each instance, the discrepancy is not serious, but what is the explanation? The Jacobean version of the story says that the miracle took place ‘in a desert’ (Mark viii. 4; cf. Matt. xv. 33), and the Petrine ‘in a desert place’ (Luke ix. 12; cf. Mark vi. 32, 35; Matt. xiv. 13, 15). We remember a statement of the book

of Judges which seems to have had an influence. ‘And they fled into the desert . . . and the children of Israel gleaned of them . . . five thousand men’ (xx. 45). In the Jacobean account the word ‘men’ is not expressed in the Greek (Mark viii. 9), but it appears in the Petrine and Johannine forms of the story (Luke ix. 14; John vi. 10), and in the later versions of it in Mark (vi. 44) and Matthew (xiv. 21, xv. 38), as in Judges. The development of the statement in the three traditions and the later versions is particularly interesting, ‘about four thousand’ (Mark viii. 9), ‘about five thousand men’ (Luke ix. 14), ‘men . . . in number about five thousand’ (John vi. 10), ‘five thousand men’ (Mark vi. 44), ‘about five thousand men, beside women and children’ (Matt. xiv. 21). Mark, we notice, improves the story by omitting ‘about,’ but Matthew by adding ‘beside women and children,’ both alterations appearing also in Matthew’s version of the Jacobean tradition, ‘four thousand men, beside women and children’ (xv. 38). Again the evidence seems to prove that the Jacobean is the earliest of the three traditions, the Petrine in this case, as it has come down to us, being more primitive than the Johannine, which omits any mention of the ‘desert,’

surely an original feature. As the Petrine and Johannine traditions are largely independent developments from a primitive parent narrative, it is quite natural that at some points one of them should retain the earlier form of text, and at others the other.

There is perhaps no need to discuss in detail every passage which affords evidence of the existence in the earliest days, for certain incidents at any rate, of a parent form of story which afterwards developed along more than one line of tradition. A final example may be the dispute about precedence which Luke, who in this context is following the Petrine tradition, places at the last supper. ‘ And there arose also a contention among them, which of them is accounted to be greatest. And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them ; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. But ye shall not be so : but he that is greater among you, let him become as the younger ; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth ? is not he that sitteth at meat ? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth ’ (xxii. 24–27). In Mark, which at this point is using Jacobean

material, another version of the saying is given as the conclusion of the story of the request of James and John, and probably it represents the last stage of the controversy raised by that incident. ‘And Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them ; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you : but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister : and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many ’ (x. 42–45).

The saying is clearly based on the description of the Servant of Jehovah, found in the second Isaiah, expanded and interpreted in terms of the sacrificial regulations of the Pentateuch. ‘Sanetify him that despiseth his life, him that is abhorred by the Gentiles that are the servants of rulers : kings shall see him and rulers shall arise, and shall worship him, for the Lord’s sake ’ (xlix. 7). ‘Behold, my servant shall understand, and shall be exalted, and shall be glorified exceedingly. . . . So shall many Gentiles wonder at him : and kings shall shut their

mouths. . . . The Lord also is pleased . . . to justify the just one who serveth many well . . . for whom his life was delivered to death' (lii. 13, 15, liii. 10 (11)-12). Among similar statements in the Pentateuch we note, 'He shall give life for life . . . he shall give the ransom of his life' (Exod. xxi. 23, 30; cf. xxx. 12, 15; Lev. xxiv. 18). The last sentence of Mark's version of the saying is absent from Luke, but it is based on an essential element in the description of the Servant, which forms the groundwork of the passage, and must be authentic. We may note the verbal agreement between Luke's introduction to the saying, and the beginning of it in Mark, echoes apparently in the Petrine and Jacobean traditions of a word in the parent narrative, 'And there arose also a contention among them, which of them is accounted to be greatest' (xxii. 24), 'Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them' (x. 42). The fact that 'Gentiles' and 'kings' are frequently mentioned together in the later Isaiahs, in the passages already quoted and elsewhere (xli. 2, xlvi. 1, xlix. 7, 22-23, [li. 4], lii. 15, lx. 3, 11, [12], 16, lxii. 2), seems to explain why the long description 'they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles' of one tradition appears

in the other as 'the kings of the Gentiles.' We note various reminiscences of the Septuagint in the Petrine tradition as it appears in Luke. 'He sent unto Jonathan the high priest, saying . . . And why dost thou vaunt thy authority against us? . . . And Jonathan had lordship over Joppa' (1 Macc. x. 69, 70, 76). 'They alone among the Gentiles lift up their heads against kings and their own benefactors' (3 Macc. iii. 19). The idea of a suffering Son of man, due to the identification of the suffering Servant of Jehovah of the second Isaiah with the Son of man of the book of Enoch, is quite common both in Mark (viii. 31, ix. 9, 12, 31, x. 33, 45, xiv. 21, 41) and in Luke (ix. 22, 44, 58, xviii. 31, xxii. 22, 48, xxiv. 7), and must be an authentic element in our Lord's teaching, so that, although it does not appear in the present saying according to the Petrine tradition preserved in Luke, there is no need to reject it as an interpolation in the Jacobean tradition utilised in Mark. The differences between the two versions of the saying are exactly such as we might expect in two reports of the same speech belonging to two distinct lines of tradition which are yet traceable to a parent source, the primitive record of the actual words of Jesus.

CHAPTER V

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE HYPOTHESIS

Now that we have distinguished the three streams of tradition in the gospels, flowing from a common source, we may consider some of the results of our conclusions on the interpretation of certain passages, and in particular our identification of certain elements as Johannine. Luke says : ‘ Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee ; or to say, Arise and walk ? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he said unto him that was palsied), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go unto thy house. And immediately he rose up before them, and took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his house ’ (v. 23–25). John says : ‘ Jesus saith unto him, Arise, take up thy bed, and walk. And straightway the man was made whole, and took up his bed and walked. Now it was the sabbath on that day. So the Jews said unto him that was cured, It is the sabbath, and it is not lawful for thee to

take up thy bed. But he answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk. They asked him, Who is the man that said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk' (v. 8-12). Mark says : ' Whether is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven ; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk ? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. And he arose, and straightway took up the bed, and went forth before them all ' (ii. 9-12).

Mark's account is clearly a conflation of Luke and John. In Luke, we note, a certain similarity to John exists, but it is not very close. In Mark, however, the similarity has practically become identity. ' Arise, take up thy bed, and walk. And straightway the man . . . took up his bed and walked,' ' Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk. . . . Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. And he . . . straightway took up the bed, and went forth.' The resemblance is the more striking because of the Greek word, used in John and Mark but not in Luke, for bed or couch, which is said by the grammarians

to be a vulgarism. In John 'Take up thy bed' is the pivot of the story, but in Mark it is quite otiose. If John's account be the latest, we have to suppose that he picked out a quite unimportant statement of Mark, not found at all in Luke, and made it the central feature of a new story, repeating it indeed several times. The argument that John would not be likely to use a vulgar word like that translated 'bed,' except as a result of literary borrowing, loses its cogency when we notice that the word is used by Luke (Acts v. 15, ix. 33), while Matthew who certainly bases his narrative on Mark avoids it. If, however, we suppose that John is one of the three chief sources of Mark, all the difficulties disappear.

The accounts of our Lord's triumphant entry into Jerusalem in Luke and John have much in common, yet it is plain that their agreement is due, not to borrowing one from the other, but merely to the fact that they are descriptions of the same incident, though by different eyewitnesses, Peter and John. Luke says : 'And they that were sent went away, and found even as he had said unto them. And as they were loosing the colt, the owners thereof said unto them, Why loose ye the colt ? And they said, The Lord hath need

of him. And they brought him to Jesus : and they threw their garments upon the colt, and set Jesus thereon. And as he went, they spread their garments in the way. And as he was now drawing nigh, even at the descent of the mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen ; saying : Blessed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord : peace in heaven, and glory in the highest. And some of the Pharisees from the multitude said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples ' (xix. 32-39). John says : ' On the morrow a great multitude that had come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, took the branches of the palm trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried out, Hosanna : Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, even the King of Israel. And Jesus, having found a young ass, sat thereon ; as it is written, Fear not, daughter of Zion : behold, thy king cometh, sitting on an ass's colt. . . . The multitude therefore that was with him when he called Lazarus out of the tomb, and raised him from the dead, bare witness. For this cause also the multitude went and met him, for that they heard that

he had done this sign. The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, Behold how ye prevail nothing : lo, the world is gone after him' (xii. 12–15, 17–19). Mark says : ' And they went away, and found a colt tied at the door without in the open street ; and they loose him. And certain of them that stood there said unto them, What do ye, loosing the colt ? And they said unto them even as Jesus had said : and they let them go. And they bring the colt unto Jesus, and cast on him their garments ; and he sat upon him. And many spread their garments upon the way ; and others branches, which they had cut from the fields. And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, Hosanna ; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord : Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David : Hosanna in the highest ' (xi. 4–10).

Mark plainly uses the Petrine tradition as the basis of his account, yet he augments it by phraseology from John,—' they found a colt,' ' having found a young ass ' ; ' and he sat upon him,' ' And Jesus . . . sat thereon ' ; ' branches, which they had cut from the fields,' ' the branches of the palm trees ' ; ' they cried,' ' they cried out.' ' They that went before, and they that followed ' appears

to be an allusion to the two multitudes mentioned in John, that which ‘was with him when he called Lazarus out of the tomb,’ and that which ‘went and met him,’ whether they should rightly be distinguished or not, Luke’s expression ‘the whole multitude of the disciples’ being interpreted as two distinct companies. Mark conflates the two accounts as a whole, but in particular the cry of the multitudes. ‘Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord’ is taken from John. David was ‘king of Israel’ (2 Kings (Sam.) vi. 20; 2 Chron. xxxv. 3), and ‘Blessed is the king that cometh,’ ‘Blessed is he that cometh . . . even the King of Israel’ become ‘Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David.’ ‘Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest’ reminds us of ‘Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace’ (Luke ii. 14), and there may be a reminiscence of other phraseology in the birth stories of Luke, ‘The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David . . . and of his kingdom there shall be no end’ (i. 32–33), ‘A horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David . . . to remember . . . the oath which he sware unto Abraham our father’ (i. 69, 72–73), ‘In the city of David

a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord' (ii. 11). Matthew awkwardly adds a popular title, 'Hosanna to the son of David : Blessed is he that cometh' (xxi. 9), the designation 'son of David' appearing three times in Luke (xviii. 38, 39, xx. 41), three times in Mark (x. 47, 48, xii. 35), and nine times in Matthew (i. 1, 20, ix. 27, xii. 23, xv. 22, xx. 30, 31, xxi. 9, 15). This strange use of 'Hosanna' had its origin in Mark's combination of 'Hosanna,' and 'Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest' to form 'Hosanna in the highest,' an unprecedented and, though so familiar to-day, a difficult and almost meaningless exclamation. Mark has other details not found in either the Petrine or Johannine tradition, but they appear to be no more than interpretative additions of the editor, and there is perhaps no sufficient reason to postulate the use of the Jacobean tradition also. It is curious that he omits the reasons for the congress of the multitudes, the working of miracles and raising of Lazarus, and the hostility of the Pharisees, which are mentioned in both the Petrine and Johannine traditions.

Recognition of the existence of the three traditions in the gospels throws light also upon the story of the cleansing of the temple.

Luke says : ‘ And he entered into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold, saying unto them, It is written, And my house shall be a house of prayer : but ye have made it a den of robbers ’ (xix. 45–46). John says : ‘ And Jesus went up to Jerusalem. And he found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting : and he made a scourge of cords, and cast all out of the temple, both the sheep and the oxen ; and he poured out the changers’ money, and overthrew their tables ; and to them that sold the doves he said, Take these things hence ; make not my Father’s house a house of merchandise ’ (ii. 13–16). Mark says : ‘ And they come to Jerusalem : and he entered into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and them that bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold the doves ; and he would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel through the temple. And he taught, and said unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations ? but ye have made it a den of robbers ’ (xi. 15–17).

Comparing the narratives, it is plain that Mark’s account is a combination of what we

find in Luke and John, together with a few editorial additions and alterations. The outline is that found in Luke, but the mention of the overthrowing of the tables of the money-changers and the selling of the doves is from John. The references to 'those that bought' and 'the seats' are apparently only editorial improvements. As Mark not infrequently enlarges Old Testament quotations (iv. 12, xii. 1, xii. 29–30, xiv. 62; cf. Luke viii. 10, xx. 9, x. 27, xxii. 69; Is. vi. 9–10, v. 1–2; Deut. vi. 4–5; Dan. vii. 13), the addition to the text from Isaiah, 'called . . . for all the nations' (lvi. 7), is easily explained. Though the market was held in the court of the Gentiles, the enlargement is somewhat incongruous, for no matter touching the Gentiles was in dispute. The longer insertion, 'And he would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel through the temple,' puts into our Lord's mouth what was apparently a well-known Jewish rule at the period. Josephus says: 'Nor is it lawful to carry any vessel into the temple.'¹ The Talmud also preserves a similar regulation, 'What is the reverence of the temple? That none go into the mountain of the temple with his staff, and his shoes, with

¹ C. Apion. ii. 8.

his purse, and dust upon his feet, and that none make it his common thoroughfare.'¹ A like prohibition held, we are told, even with regard to a synagogue. R. Eleazar ben Shammua said : 'I never made a synagogue a common thoroughfare.'² We even read: 'A synagogue, now laid waste, let not men make a common thoroughfare.'³ The composite character of Mark's narrative is plain, and he has not limited himself to a combination of different apostolic traditions. Evidently the cleansing is regarded as taking place only once, though John puts it at the beginning of our Lord's ministry and Luke at the end. Before his account of the cleansing John says : 'And the passover of the Jews was nigh, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. And he found in the temple . . .' (ii. 13-14), and before his account of the triumphal entry, 'Jesus therefore six days before the passover came to Bethany. . . . On the morrow a great multitude that had come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, took the branches of the palm trees, and went forth to meet him' (xii. 1, 12-13). Doubtless similar notes of time appeared in the Petrine

¹ Babylonian *Yebamoth*, fol. 6b. See Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* in *Works* (1823), vol. xi. pp. 413-4.

² *Megillah*, fol. 27b.

³ *Ibid.* fol. 28a.

tradition in its original form, but Luke has equated them. ‘And . . . he went on before, going up to Jerusalem. And it came to pass, when he drew nigh unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount that is called the mount of Olives, he sent two of his disciples. . . . And as he went, they spread their garments in the way. . . . And he entered into the temple. . . . Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover’ (xix. 28–29, 36, 45, xxii. 1). Luke puts both the triumphant entry and the cleansing of the temple on the Sunday. Mark puts the latter on the Monday, introducing his account by the words ‘And they come to Jerusalem,’ corresponding to ‘And Jesus went up to Jerusalem’ of John. There can be little doubt that the fourth gospel is more accurate in this matter than either Luke or Mark.

Almost at the point where Luke says our Lord saw the city of Jerusalem and wept over it in disappointment, Mark says He saw a fig tree afar off, and drawing near was disappointed to find nothing but leaves. Indeed, both incidents are said to have taken place in the course of the journey to Jerusalem which preceded the cleansing of the temple. What is the connexion between the two

events ? Mark says : ‘ And on the morrow, when they were come out from Bethany, he hungered. And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything thereon : and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves ; for it was not the season of figs. And he answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever. And his disciples heard it. . . . And as they passed by in the morning, they saw the fig tree withered away from the roots. And Peter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Rabbi, behold, the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away. And Jesus answering saith unto them, Have faith in God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea ; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass ; he shall have it. Therefore I say unto you, All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them. And whensoever ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any one ; that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses’ (xi. 12-14, 20-25). The passage is certainly built up in part of material from the tradition of James.

Our Lord's reply to Peter is clearly another version of His saying about the sycamine tree found in Luke. ' If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea ; and it would have obeyed you ' (xvii. 6). In the Septuagint the sycamine tree is the fig-mulberry (3 (1) Kings x. 31 (27) ; 1 Chron. xxvii. 28 ; 2 Chron. i. 15, ix. 27 ; Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 47 ; Is. ix. 10 ; Amos vii. 14), the sycamore of the story of Zacchæus (Luke xix. 4). The fig and sycamore trees have similar fruits, but otherwise the connexion between the cursing of the fig tree and the saying about the sycamine tree is not obvious, for the withering of the fig tree was not the result of an act of faith in God. Even this connexion has disappeared, however, in the saying as given in Mark, for we read : ' Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea.' The change appears to be due to the influence of the Talmud. We read : ' Rabbah [bar Nachmani] is a rooter up of mountains,'¹ ' He saw Resh Lachish in the school, as if he were plucking up of mountains.'² The fact that the result produced a saying of the

¹ Bab. *Berakoth*, fol. 64a. See Lightfoot, *Works*, xi. p. 270.

² Bab. *Sanh.*, fol. 24a ; cf. Bab. *Erubin*, fol. 29a.

psalmist probably helped the change, ' though the mountains be moved in the heart of the seas ' (xlv. (xlvi). 2).

The latter part of our Lord's reply is likewise based on passages in the tradition of James found in Luke. ' If thy brother sin, rebuke him ; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent ; thou shalt forgive him ' (xvii. 3-4). ' One of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray. . . . And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Father . . . Forgive us our sins ; for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us. . . . And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you. . . . For every one that asketh receiveth ' (xi. 1-2, 4, 9-10). The first passage immediately precedes the saying about the sycamine tree, and the second contains the same teaching about forgiveness, shewing that it is the only basis of effective prayer. Yet the saying recorded in Mark is not based directly on the sayings quoted from Luke. ' Your Father which is in heaven ' is a characteristic expression of the first gospel, occurring in it no fewer than thirteen times (v. 16, 45, vi. 1, 9, vii. 11, 21, x. 32, 33, xii. 50, xvi. 17, xviii. 10, 14, 19), but

elsewhere in the New Testament only in the present passage. An examination of Matthew x. 17–22, which deals with persecutions, shews that, though later than Luke xxi. 12–19 and Luke xii. 11–12, which it conflates, it is earlier than Mark xiii. 9–13, a fact indeed which in the case of one or two verses we have noted already. The same thing is true with regard to the section of Mark under discussion. Mark xi. 24–25 is later than the corresponding words in Matthew vi. and vii. Matthew says : ‘After this manner therefore pray ye : Our Father which art in heaven. . . . Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. . . . For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses. . . . Ask, and it shall be given you . . . for every one that asketh receiveth ’ (vi. 9, 12, 14–15, vii. 7–8).

It is plain that the verses of Mark under consideration cannot belong to our Lord’s journey into Jerusalem on the last Monday of His earthly life as the gospel seems to say. What is given as a reply to Peter is really a highly composite saying, compiled of material from various sources, rabbinical as well as evangelical, though in the main it is derived

from the Jacobean line of tradition by the modification and combination of different sayings.

If the reply to Peter can be explained in this way, what are we to say of the rest of the story ? Is it the report of an historical incident, or is it to be regarded as a piece of early Christian midrash ? Its position in the gospel narrative and the fact that the spiritual interpretation of our Lord's disappointment with regard to the fig tree is His disappointment with regard to Jerusalem, over which He wept, suggest the latter. The parable of the barren fig tree makes the interpretation clear. ‘A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard ; and he came seeking fruit thereon, and found none. And he said unto the vinedresser, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none : cut it down ; why doth it also cumber the ground ? And he answering saith unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it : and if it bear fruit thenceforth, well : but if not, thou shalt cut it down’ (Luke xiii. 6–9). Like the illustration of the sycamine tree the parable belongs to the Jacobean line of tradition. If a saying made on another very different occasion can be

given as an answer to Peter on the way to Jerusalem, it is not impossible that the parable of the barren fig tree should be regarded as an actual incident which called forth the reply. The problem is a literary one, and the change involved is no greater than that by which ‘Ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea,’ becomes ‘Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea.’ In one case as in the other it would only mean that the original nucleus is modified from other sources. The warning to the fig tree, ‘If it bear fruit thenceforth, well ; but if not, thou shalt cut it down,’ is exactly our Lord’s warning to Jerusalem and the Jews, ‘Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish’ (Luke xiii. 5, cf. 3). The signs of the destruction of Jerusalem and the coming of the kingdom He had explained by another parable of a fig tree. ‘Behold the fig tree, and all the trees : when they now shoot forth, ye see it and know of your own selves that the summer is now nigh. Even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh’ (Luke xxi. 29–31). The promise of the book of Proverbs is reversed. ‘He that planteth a

fig tree shall eat the fruits of it' (xxvii. 18), 'No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever.' John Baptist's warning, which is given in the sermon on the mount as a saying of our Lord (Matt. vii. 19), is specially applicable to Jerusalem. 'Every tree . . . that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire' (Luke iii. 9). Yet our Lord's final sentence on the fig tree, that is, Jerusalem, was not that it should be cut down, but that it should wither. 'If they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?' (Luke xxiii. 31). 'Rooted up' of the parable thus becomes 'withered away from the roots' in the narrative of Mark. Even details of time and occasion had been prophesied by the psalmist. 'In the morning let it flourish and pass away; in the evening let it droop, let it be withered and dried up' (lxxxix. (xc.) 6). 'They that be cursed of him shall be cut off. . . . I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green tree in its native soil. But one passed by, and, lo, he was not' (xxxvii. 22, 35-36, Heb.). 'And as they passed by in the morning, they saw the fig tree withered away from the roots.' Comparing Matthew xviii. 21-22 with Luke xvii. 3-4 we find that it was Peter who asked the

question which led to the sayings about forgiveness and faith (*Luke xvii. 3–6*) which, modified and conflated with other sayings (*Luke xi. 1–2, 4, 9–10 = Matt. vi. 9, 12, 14–15, vii. 7–8*), appear in *Mark* as a short discourse at the conclusion of the story of the fig tree. So, too, it was Peter who made the remark to which in the second gospel this discourse is given as the reply. The name has persisted though the change in the context is immense, for instead of forgiveness of a brother until seven times we read of vengeance on a fig tree because nothing but leaves was found upon it, in spite of the fact that, as the evangelist says, ‘it was not the season of figs.’ Though a saying about forgiveness also survives, it seems very much out of place attached to the lesson about the necessity of faith the writer would have us draw from an incident which it is difficult to regard as anything but an arbitrary act of punishment. As the account of an actual event the story appears impossible, and must be explained as the result of the materialisation of parables and metaphorical sayings into a narrative historical in form in the course of a process of literary development and accretion. If the story stood alone we might hesitate to postulate such an origin, but other examples

of the same thing may be recognised in the second gospel, including, as we shall see, the portents at the time of the crucifixion with the cry of dereliction, and also what is the most important instance, the long discourse on the last things.

CHAPTER VI

THE ANOINTING OF JESUS

IN Mark just before the narrative of the passion we have an account of a woman anointing our Lord's head : ' And while he was at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster cruse of ointment of spikenard very costly ; and she brake the cruse, and poured it over his head. But there were some that had indignation among themselves, saying, To what purpose hath this waste of the ointment been made ? For this ointment might have been sold for above three hundred pence, and given to the poor. And they murmured against her. But Jesus said, Let her alone ; why trouble ye her ? she hath wrought a good work on me. For ye have the poor always with you, and whensoever ye will ye can do them good : but me ye have not always. She hath done what she could : she hath anointed my body beforehand for the burying. And verily I say

unto you, Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her' (xiv. 3-9).

As the story is absent from Luke at the point it is apparently no part of the Petrine tradition, and must be ascribed to James or John, or both, for there seems to be no reason to postulate another source. Luke gives another story of an anointing in a section made up of material drawn from the Jacobean line of tradition. ' And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he entered into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. And behold, a woman which was in the city, a sinner ; and when she knew that he was sitting at meat in the Pharisee's house, she brought an alabaster cruse of ointment, and standing behind at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him saw it, he spake within himself, saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have perceived who and what manner of woman this is which toucheth him, that she is a sinner. And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say

unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on. A certain lender had two debtors : the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. When they had not wherewith to pay, he forgave them both. Which of them therefore will love him most ? Simon answered and said, He, I suppose, to whom he forgave the most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. And turning to the woman, he said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman ? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet : but she hath wetted my feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. Thou gavest me no kiss : but she, since the time I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint : but she hath anointed my feet with ointment. Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven ; for she loved much : but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little. And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that even forgiveth sins ? And he said unto the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee ; go in peace ' (vii. 36-50).

John also gives us a story of an anointing, placing it just before his account of the

triumphant entry : ‘ Jesus therefore six days before the passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, whom Jesus raised from the dead. So they made him a supper there : and Martha served ; but Lazarus was one of them that sat at meat with him. Mary therefore took a pound of ointment of spikenard, very precious, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair : and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. But Judas Iscariot, one of his disciples, which should betray him, saith, Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor ? Now this he said, not because he cared for the poor ; but because he was a thief, and having the bag took away what was put therein. Jesus therefore said, Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying. For the poor ye have always with you ; but me ye have not always ’ (xii. 1–8).

It is plain that the narratives of Mark and John cannot be entirely independent. Not only phrases, but whole sentences are practically identical—‘ while he was in Bethany,’ ‘ Jesus . . . came to Bethany ’ ; ‘ in the house,’ ‘ the house ’ ; ‘ as he sat at meat,’ ‘ them that sat at meat with him ’ ; ‘ of ointment of spikenard very costly,’ ‘ of

ointment of spikenard, very precious'; 'Why [To what purpose] hath this waste of the ointment been made,' 'Why was not this ointment sold'; 'this ointment might have been sold for above three hundred pence, and given to the poor,' 'Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor'; 'But Jesus said, Let her alone,' 'Jesus therefore said, Let her alone [Suffer her]'; 'For ye have the poor always with you . . . but me ye have not always,' 'For the poor ye have always with you; but me ye have not always'; 'for the burying,' 'for [against] the day of my burying.' In his account of the voyage over the lake after the feeding of the multitude we decided that Mark was using material from the Johannine tradition; the evidence points to the same conclusion in the present passage.

Yet, as in the story of the voyage, Mark appears to have drawn upon the Jacobean line of tradition as well as the Johannine, and his account of the anointing has various points in common with Luke's account of the anointing of our Lord by the woman that was a sinner—'in the house of Simon,' 'in the house of the Pharisee . . . Simon'; 'he sat at meat,' 'he was sitting at meat';

' there came a woman,' ' behold, a woman ' ;
' having an alabaster cruse of ointment,' ' she
brought an alabaster cruse of ointment ' ;
' she poured it over his head,' ' my head with
oil thou didst not anoint ' ; ' But Jesus said,'
' And Jesus answering said.'

Yet not the whole of Mark's narrative can be explained as derived from the Jacobean and Johannine traditions as we know them. In particular the statements that Simon was a leper and that the woman broke the box of ointment seem to indicate the use of additional information or another line of tradition. Certain elements are almost certainly editorial additions, while others may be such. The influence of the Old Testament is also apparent at some points. Mark says the woman poured the ointment over our Lord's head, but Luke and John that she anointed His feet. To pour oil upon the head is common in the Old Testament (*Exod.* xxix. 7; *Lev.* viii. 12, xxi. 10; *1 Kings* (*Sam.*) x. 1; *4 (2) Kings* ix. 3, 6; cf. *Lev.* xiv. 18), though the word in the Greek has a different prefix. The reading in Mark therefore is probably due to assimilation, possibly also to the influence of the saying to Simon, ' My head with oil thou didst not anoint,' and even of the reference to the woman's ' head ' in

the Jacobean form of the story. To anoint the head in the Old Testament however is a sign of joy (Ps. xxii. (xxiii.) 5), not of sorrow, and in no case is it an accompaniment of a burial or used of a corpse. Our Lord's explanation of the action provides an argument against the originality of the reading in Mark, and in favour of that in Luke.

'But there were some that had indignation among themselves' is a statement with no parallel in the traditions recorded in Luke and John. The Greek for 'have indignation' appears once in Luke (xiii. 14), three times in Mark (x. 14, 41, xiv. 4), and three times in Matthew (xx. 24, xxi. 15, xxvi. 8). As the example in Luke and one at any rate of the examples in Mark (x. 41) are found in Jacobean material, it is not improbable that the present example has the same origin. 'And they murmured against her' has likewise no parallel in the other traditions. The Greek word translated 'they murmured' occurs twice in Mark (i. 43, xiv. 5), once in Matthew (ix. 30), and twice in John (xi. 33, 38), but not in Luke or elsewhere in the New Testament, and only once in the Septuagint (Dan. xi. 30; cf. Lam. ii. 6). In Mark i. 43 the word seems due to an assimilation of the phraseology of the narrative to that of the

healing of the two blind men in the house (Matt. ix. 27-31), which is apparently the Jacobean equivalent of the story of the healing of the blind man at Jericho in the Petrine tradition (Luke xviii. 35-43), so that in the present passage the addition is perhaps likewise Jacobean and not merely editorial. ‘Why trouble ye her?’ which is also absent from the traditions given in Luke and John, is likewise not improbably Jacobean, similar words appearing twice in Luke (xi. 7, xviii. 5), each time in Jacobean material, but only once in Mark and Matthew (xxvi. 10) in the present story, and once in the epistle to the Galatians (vi. 17). It is found also in Ecclesiasticus (xxix. 4). ‘She hath wrought [worked] a good work on me’ is also wanting from the traditions in Luke and John. Apart from the present narrative, where it appears in Matthew (xxvi. 10) as well as in Mark, the phrase ‘work a work’ is found only twice in the New Testament (Acts xiii. 41; 1 Cor. xvi. 10), once in a quotation from Habakkuk (i. 5). In the Septuagint it appears but twice (Hab. i. 5; Ecclus. li. 30). The form ‘work the works’ is found twice in John (vi. 28, ix. 4), and five times in the book of Numbers (iii. 7, viii. 11, 15, 19, 26), but not elsewhere. The phrase ‘good work’ appears also twice

in John (x. 32, 33), and twice in Matthew (v. 16, xxvi. 10), and ten times in the rest of the New Testament, all but two in the Pastoral Epistles. ‘And whosoever ye will ye can do them good’ is absent from all the other accounts of the anointing, the rest of the saying in almost identical words being given in John. The Greek phrase for ‘do good’ appears nowhere else in the New Testament, but it is quite common in the Septuagint, occurring thirty times. We note in particular a saying in Ecclesiasticus: ‘If thou do good, know to whom thou doest it. . . . Do good to a godly man. . . . Do good to one that is lowly’ (xii. 1, 2, 5). The prediction at the end of Mark’s account is likewise absent from the stories in Luke and John. The noun ‘gospel’ does not appear in either of these gospels, though Mark has it seven times (i. 1, 14, 15, viii. 35, x. 29, xiii. 10, xiv. 9), and Matthew four (iv. 23, ix. 35, xxiv. 14, xxvi. 13), but except in the eschatological discourse and the present context the word does not appear in the same positions in the two books. In every case it would seem to be a later addition, expressing the ideas of the early church. The phrase ‘the whole world’ is found once in Luke (ix. 25) and twice in Mark (viii. 36,

xiv. 9) and Matthew (xvi. 26, xxvi. 13), in the present context and another, also once in the epistle to the Romans (i. 8) and twice in the first epistle of John (ii. 2, v. 19). In Luke and the corresponding passages of Mark and Matthew it occurs in an interpretative addition to a saying recorded in Luke xvii. 33, based on a passage of the Apocalypse of Baruch (li. 15–16), as we have seen. It is not improbable therefore that in the present context also the phrase is due to the editor. The prediction about preaching the gospel throughout the whole world is thus probably not part of the primitive tradition of our Lord's words. In the eschatological discourse the saying, 'the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations' (xiii. 10), we have already decided, is a later addition to the original text. The Greek word for 'memorial' occurs only in the present context in the gospels, in Matthew (xxvi. 13) as well as Mark, once also in Acts (x. 4), but not elsewhere in the New Testament. It is quite frequent in the Septuagint, occurring seventy-one times, particularly in Ecclesiasticus, where it appears seventeen times. We notice in particular, 'There be of them, that have left a name behind them, to declare their praises. And some there be, which have

no memorial. . . . And the congregation telleth out their praise' (xlv. 8, 9, 15). The passage with its reference to the 'church' or 'congregation' may have suggested the saying in the gospel. In Mark however, though she has such a memorial, the woman has left no name. The whole verse would appear to be an interpretative addition, originating perhaps in the comment of a primitive evangelist.

Our investigation seems to have shewn that certain details of the narrative of Mark are in all probability due to editorial expansion and the influence of the Old Testament, but that the writer must have had access to some other source of information than the stories quoted above, though apparently it was part of the tradition of James.

The accounts of the anointing given in Luke and John have also much in common. In both instances it took place while Jesus 'sat at meat' in a 'house.' In the Jacobean story of Luke we read: 'She brought an alabaster cruse of ointment, and standing behind at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.' In the Johannine story we read: 'Mary

therefore took a pound of ointment of spikenard, very precious, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair.' Both mention the 'ointment,' the anointing and wiping of His feet with her hair. The two narratives must be different accounts of the same event. Luke gives also another story in his collection of Jacobean material of an incident which apparently took place on the same occasion : ' Now as they went on their way, he entered into a certain village : and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at the Lord's feet, and heard his word. But Martha was cumbered about much serving ; and she came up to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone ? bid her therefore that she help me. But the Lord answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things : but one thing is needful : for Mary hath chosen the good part, which shall not be taken away from her ' (x. 38-42). In this story, as in that given by John, we hear of Martha and Mary, and what happened in connexion with a meal in a house. In Luke we read, ' But Martha was cumbered about much serving . . . my

sister did leave me to serve alone,' but in John, 'and Martha served.' Another passage of John is also of importance. 'Now a certain man was sick, Lazarus of Bethany, of the village of Mary and her sister Martha. And it was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair' (xi. 1-2). Luke speaks of 'a certain village,' John of 'the village.' Luke says, 'a certain woman named Martha . . . had a sister called Mary,' John, 'Mary and her sister Martha,' also 'Martha, and her sister' (xi. 5). In one of Luke's stories we read of the woman 'standing behind at his feet,' in the other that Mary 'sat at the Lord's feet.' It is surely impossible to suppose that Luke's two stories refer to two different occasions, or that the anointing in Luke is other than identical with that differently described in John. The same incident seems to have given rise to three different complaints, described in three separate stories, two preserved in Luke, and one in John, the last also in Mark and Matthew. Martha complained that Mary had left her to serve alone, Simon that the woman was a sinner, and Judas that the ointment might have been sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor. Only the first two are recorded in

the Jacobean narrative of Luke, but it is difficult to imagine that the tradition traceable to James recorded the first two but ignored the third. It seems more probable that for some reason or other, perhaps to avoid repetition, Luke omitted the last. If so, it was apparently from this lost version of the story that Mark derived his additional information, which he conflated with material drawn from the Jacobean account of the anointing still preserved in Luke, and that of John. Presumably it connected the betrayal with the incident of the anointing, and shewed how it came to pass that Satan entered into Judas Iscariot and put it into his heart to betray Jesus (Luke xxii. 3-4; John xiii. 2). In Mark the incident occupies the place where in Luke we are told that Satan entered into Judas, but otherwise there is nothing to connect the two things, and apart from a comparison of Luke and Mark the position of the story in the second gospel is pointless and an obvious interpolation in a narrative which reads much better without it. If Mark is utilising the Jacobean tradition for the position as well as for some of the substance of his story there is an adequate explanation.

At the end of the Jacobean account of

the anointing given by Luke there is an addition which tends to obscure the proper significance of the story : ‘ And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that even forgiveth sins ? And he said unto the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee ; go in peace ’ (vii. 49–50). We compare two other passages in Luke : ‘ And seeing their faith, he said, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee. And the scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this that speaketh blasphemies ? Who can forgive sins, but God alone ’ (v. 20–21), ‘ And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole ; go in peace ’ (viii. 48). The existence of parallel passages in different contexts leaves little room for doubt that we have an interpretative addition to the account of the anointing, though it is really out of harmony with the proper lesson of the story. We notice that in this case the Jacobean narrative is augmented from the Petrine ; usually it is the reverse.

CHAPTER VII

THE LAST SUPPER

A KNOWLEDGE of the sources helps us to understand very much better the order of events at the last supper. The accounts of the third and fourth gospels are primary, derived from the Petrine and Johannine lines of tradition, that of Mark being secondary, a conflation of the three traditions of Peter, James, and John. The date according to John was the evening before the paschal lambs were slain : ‘Now before the feast of the passover, Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father . . . during supper . . . riseth from supper’ (xiii. 1, 2, 4). The next day we are told, ‘Now it was the Preparation of the passover’ (xix. 14). Luke says : ‘And the day of unleavened bread came, on which the passover must be sacrificed. . . . And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him’ (xxii. 7, 14). Earlier he had said : ‘Now the feast

of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover' (xxii. 1). Similar statements are not uncommon in the writings of Josephus¹: 'The feast of unleavened bread was celebrated, which we call the Passover,'² 'Upon the approach of that feast of unleavened bread . . . which feast is called the Passover,'³ 'The feast of unleavened bread, which was now at hand, and is by the Jews called the Passover.'⁴ According to Josephus the feast of unleavened bread was commonly regarded as including the day on which the paschal lambs were sacrificed, the fourteenth of Nisan. 'When the fourteenth day was come . . . they offered the sacrifice. . . . Whence it is that we do still offer this sacrifice in like manner to this day, and call this festival *Pascha*, which signifies the feast of the Passover. . . . We keep a feast for eight days, which is called the feast of unleavened bread.'⁵ 'As the feast of unleavened bread was now come, when they had offered that sacrifice which is called the Passover, they after that offered other sacrifices for seven days.'⁶ 'On the feast of unleavened bread, which was now come, it being the four-

¹ Eng. trans. Whiston.

³ *Ibid.* xvii. ix. 3.

⁵ *Ant.* ii. xiv. 6, xv. 1.

² *Ant.* xiv. ii. 1.

⁴ *Bell.* ii. i. 3.

⁶ *Ibid.* ix. xiii. 3.

teenth day of the month Xanthicus.¹ Yet on occasion Josephus distinguishes the two feasts. ‘In the month of Xanthicus, which is by us called Nisan, and is the beginning of our year, on the fourteenth day of the lunar month . . . the law ordained that we should every year slay that sacrifice . . . which was called the Passover; and so do we celebrate this passover in companies. . . . The feast of unleavened bread succeeds that of the passover, and falls on the fifteenth day of the month, and continues seven days, wherein they feed on unleavened bread. . . . But on the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month, they first partake of the fruits of the earth.’² Luke evidently identifies the two. ‘The feast of unleavened bread . . . is called the Passover,’ and ‘the day of unleavened bread . . . on which the passover must be sacrificed’ is therefore the fourteenth day of Nisan. Mark likewise seems to equate the two, ‘Now after two days was the feast of the passover and the unleavened bread’ (xiv. 1). Otherwise his other date would be nonsense, ‘on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover’ (xiv. 12), for the first day of unleavened

¹ *Bell.* v. iii. 1.

² *Ant.* III. x. 5.

bread would be the day following the paschal meal. According to Mark the first day of unleavened bread is the fourteenth of Nissan, but according to Josephus the fifteenth. To Mark it means the first day of the feast of unleavened bread in the wider sense, not the first day on which only unleavened bread is eaten, though the latter is more natural, particularly in view of the adjective 'first.' The absence of 'first' from the more original statement of Luke makes the interpretation of it easier, and suggests that the reference is to the feast in the broader meaning, and that day of the feast on which the passover must be sacrificed.

Mark's expression 'on the first day of unleavened bread' might refer to any time of that day, whereas Luke's 'the day of unleavened bread came' suggests the beginning. The same expression is found elsewhere in the fourth gospel, 'his hour was come' (xiii. 1), 'her hour is come' (xvi. 21), and in the Apocalypse, 'the hour of his judgment is come' (xiv. 7), 'the hour to reap is come' (xiv. 15). In each case the reference is to the very beginning of the hour and the action is still in the future. 'The day of unleavened bread came' seems then to mean the period just after the

sunset which marked the close of Nisan the thirteenth. There is thus no discrepancy between Luke and John, and even Mark seems patient of the same interpretation.

Luke says ‘when the hour was come,’ and the natural meaning is ‘when it was time.’ Mark’s phrase, ‘when it was evening,’ is a paraphrase of it on this assumption. John however interprets it quite differently: ‘Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father’ (xiii. 1). Probably both are traceable to the same original, but John has given a spiritual interpretation to the words.

According to John, supper being ready, Jesus washed the disciples’ feet and gave the discourse on humility: ‘He riseth from supper, and layeth aside his garments; and he took a towel, and girded himself. Then he poureth water into the bason, and began to wash the disciples’ feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. . . . So when he had washed their feet, and taken his garments, and sat down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me, Master, and, Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another’s feet. For I

have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, A servant is not greater than his lord ; neither one that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them' (xiii. 4-5, 12-17). The saying in Luke which we are told was uttered as a result of the contention which of them was to be accounted greatest is apparently the Petrine version of the discourse. ' He that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger ; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth ? is not he that sitteth at meat ? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth ' (xxii. 26-27). We have also in Mark, as we have seen, the Jacobean version of the saying : ' Whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister : and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many ' (x. 43-45). This last form of the saying makes it plain that it is based on the description of the Servant in the second Isaiah, ' The Lord also is pleased . . . to justify the just one who serveth many

well . . . for whom his life was delivered to death' (lili. 10 (11)-12). The Johannine account is now seen to echo the phraseology of Isaiah as he describes the Servant, 'The Lord that formed me from the womb to be his own servant' (xlix. 5), 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; . . . he hath sent me' (lxi. 1). The equivalence of the three versions of our Lord's saying is thus confirmed. In John we see the connexion between the discourse and the feet washing, so that apparently the dispute about precedence was the occasion for this. If so, Luke's account of the incident and with it presumably the three following verses, Luke xxii. 24-30, should properly be inserted between verses 14 and 15.

Further confirmation of the view that Luke and John give merely different reports of the same original saying of Jesus about humility is to be found in an examination of Luke's earlier account of a similar dispute. Mark says: 'And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning in the way? But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another in the way, who was the greatest' (ix. 33-34). Luke has simply, 'And there arose a reasoning among them,

which of them should be greatest' (ix. 46). There is evidently assimilation to the introduction to his second account of such a dispute. 'And there arose also a contention among them, which of them is accounted to be greatest' (xxii. 24). There is however an even more curious example of assimilation in the earlier narrative of Luke. We read : 'But when Jesus saw the reasoning of their heart, he took a little child, and set him by his side, and said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this little child in my name, receiveth me : and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me : for he that is least among you all, the same is great' (ix. 47-48). We notice at once the incongruity of the saying about receiving the little child. When our Lord rebuked the disciples because they had hindered little children from being brought unto Him, He said 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not : for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein' (xviii. 16-17). Again we notice incongruity, for the fact that men must receive the kingdom of God like little children does not follow naturally after the rebuke of those

who would hinder them from being brought to Jesus ; there is a quick change of interest from the children to men in general, which is none the less apparent because both sayings speak of the relation of children to the kingdom of God, presumably the fact which brought about the combination. If the second part of our Lord's rebuke of the disciples be inserted in His saying about humility instead of that which speaks of the receiving of the little child the sequence of thought is much better : ‘ But when Jesus saw the reasoning of their heart, he took a little child, and set him by his side, and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein ; for he that is least among you all, the same is great.’ That our reconstruction is correct seems to be proved by the fact that this is what we find in Matthew, ‘ And he called to him a little child, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven ’ (xviii. 2-4). We might suppose that the saying

about receiving the little child ought to take the place of the second part of our Lord's rebuke of those who forbade the little children to be brought to Him, and it would not be an altogether incongruous conclusion of the saying, but Matthew, who in the account of the dispute about precedence preserves the earliest version of the story, gives here nothing to correspond, but simply, 'Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come unto me : for of such is the kingdom of heaven' (xix. 14). Whence, then, has the misplaced saying about the receiving of the little child been derived ? In a Jacobean collection of sayings Luke gives a similar word : 'He that heareth you heareth me ; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me ; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me' (x. 16). In a similar collection of sayings in Matthew, also Jacobean, it takes a different form : 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me' (x. 40). Neither in Luke nor in Matthew is there any real evidence of the occasion of the utterance, the collections of sayings being compiled, it would seem, to some extent fortuitously, though in part according to similarity of subject-matter. In John the saying appears at the end of the

discourse on humility after the feet-washing at the last supper : ‘ Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me ; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me ’ (xiii. 20). We notice the connexion with the verse a little earlier, ‘ A servant is not greater than his lord ; neither one that is sent greater than he that sent him,’ and therefore with the description of the Servant in Isaiah, ‘ The Spirit of the Lord is upon me ; . . . he hath sent me ’ (lxii. 1). There can be no doubt that the saying belongs properly to the discourse at the last supper, and not to the earlier saying about true greatness. Luke therefore, we conclude, in his account of the first dispute about precedence has not only utilised a modified version of the introduction to the second dispute, apparently instead of the introduction found in Mark or something similar, but also in the place of a saying transferred to our Lord’s rebuke of those who hindered the little children from coming to Him has incorporated a saying, belonging properly to the second dispute, recorded in the description of the last supper in the fourth gospel. Our conclusion that the dispute about precedence at the last supper, and in particular our Lord’s saying about humility

given in Luke's account of the last supper, and the similar discourse after the feet-washing recorded by John as taking place on the same occasion are two reports of the same original discourse of Jesus receives further confirmation.

According to John in a reference to Judas in His discourse on humility at the beginning of the last supper Jesus quoted Psalm xl. (xli.) 9 : ' I speak not of you all : I know whom I have chosen : but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me ' (xiii. 18). In a later speech, after being troubled in spirit, He said : ' Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me ' (xiii. 21). The latter is, in part, the Johannine equivalent of the saying recorded in the Petrine tradition in Luke, ' Behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table ' (xxii. 21). The descriptions of the immediate consequences are very similar in the two traditions, Johannine and Petrine. ' The disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake ' (John xiii. 22), ' And they began to question among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing ' (Luke xxii. 23). According to Luke the announcement of the betrayal followed the

institution of the eucharist. Consequently, if our identification is correct, the eucharist must have been instituted after the initial discourse on humility and before Jesus was troubled in spirit according to the Johannine scheme of events, that is, between the sayings recorded in John xiii. 20 and 21. Mark conflates the two Johannine sayings about Judas (xiii. 18, 21), repeating the second without alteration, and putting the result at the point to which the earlier saying which quotes Psalm xl. (xli.) belongs, before the institution of the eucharist, if our conclusion with regard to this is correct. ‘And as they sat and were eating, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you shall betray me, even he that eateth with me’ (xiv. 18). We note that he adds to the Petrine setting of Luke the words ‘as they were eating,’ so as to fit the context to the words he puts into the mouth of Jesus, though in Luke, except in the words ‘I have desired to eat this passover’ (xxii. 15), there is no suggestion of either eating or drinking before the blessing of the cup which introduces the institution of the eucharist.

As the climax of the disciples’ questioning about the identity of the traitor John gives the episode of the sop : ‘The disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake.

There was at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoneth to him, and saith unto him, Tell us who it is of whom he speaketh. He leaning back, as he was, on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it ? Jesus therefore answereth, He it is, for whom I shall dip the sop, and give it him. So when he had dipped the sop, he taketh and giveth it to Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot. And after the sop, then entered Satan into him ' (xiii. 22-27). Mark gives a shorter account of the disciples' questioning and the incident of the sop : ' They began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I ? And he said unto them, It is one of the twelve, he that dippeth with me in the dish ' (xiv. 19-20). The narrative differs widely from that in John, and as it is not contained in the Petrine tradition given by Luke, it is apparently Jacobean. ' One of the twelve ' is a description of Judas in both the Petrine (Luke xxii. 47, cf. 3) and Johannine (vi. 71) traditions, though John uses it also of Thomas (xx. 24). In the present context apparently it belongs to the Jacobean tradition. Mark himself evidently considered ' It is one of the twelve, he that dippeth with me in the dish ' the equivalent of ' Behold, the hand of him

that betrayeth me is with me on the table' in the Petrine tradition, and Matthew conflates the two, putting the dipping into the past, 'He that dipped his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me' (xxvi. 23). Not improbably, however, the Petrine statement in Luke, in which there is no explicit reference to the sop, 'Behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table,' was intended to be a combination of our Lord's two sayings about the traitor, the Johannine (xiii. 21) and Jacobean, which are given in Mark, 'Verily I say unto you, One of you shall betray me . . . he that dippeth with me in the dish' (xiv. 18, 20). It is very unlikely that the sop was such a titbit as an Oriental host might give to a guest whom he wished specially to honour. Apparently it was only a morsel of bread. We compare, 'Comfort thine heart with a morsel of bread' (Judges xix. 5), 'Thou shalt eat of the bread, and dip thy morsel in the vinegar' (Ruth ii. 14). The Greek word for 'sop' is the diminutive of that used for 'morsel' in these passages. We find a similar usage at table described in Ecclesiasticus, 'Sittest thou at a great table? . . . Stretch not thine hand whithersoever it [the eye] looketh, and thrust not thyself with it

into the dish. . . . And if thou sittest among many, reach not out thy hand before them' (xxxiv. (xxxii.) 12, 14, 18). The report of the incident must be derived from the disciple 'whom Jesus loved' whom we have identified with John the son of Zebedee, so that it is natural that the full account should appear only in the fourth gospel. The sign would seem to have been that when Judas stretched forth his hand to dip his morsel in the dish our Lord did likewise, and indeed anticipated him, giving him the morsel He Himself had dipped, perhaps a common act of politeness, so that Judas had no need to complete the action. The Johannine account concludes, 'And after the sop, then entered Satan into him,' a statement which the Petrine narrative puts at an earlier point, before the traitor's original compact with the chief priests, 'And Satan entered into Judas who was called Iscariot' (Luke xxii. 3).

Between the announcement of the betrayal and the disciples' questioning among themselves which resulted we read in the Petrine tradition in Luke, 'For the Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been determined: but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed' (xxii. 22). There is a reference to the predictions of the passion,

and particularly the third, ‘ All the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man. For he shall be betrayed unto the Gentiles ’ (xviii. 31–32). The particular prophecy in view is plainly the description of the sufferings of the Servant in the second Isaiah, ‘ Because of their iniquities he was betrayed ’ (liii. 12). Mark, who omits any reference to the scriptures in his version of our Lord’s third prediction of His passion (x. 33), by what is practically a conflation of the two sayings as given in Luke makes the reference quite explicit here, ‘ For the Son of man goeth, even as it is written of him : but woe unto that man through whom the Son of man is betrayed ’ (xiv. 21). Mark then makes an addition to the prediction not in Luke, ‘ Good were it for that man if he had not been born ’ (xiv. 21). Its source is found in current Jewish literature, so that as in the case of the saying from the Apocalypse of Baruch (li. 15) inserted among the words of Jesus in an earlier passage (viii. 37), we have confirmation of our view of the secondary character of Mark. In the book of Enoch we notice, ‘ It had been good for them if they had not been born ’¹ (xxxviii. 2), and in the

¹ Eng. trans. Charles.

Mishnah and Gemara, 'It were better for him that he had not come into the world,'¹ 'As for him . . . it were better had he never been created.'² Mark omits any mention of the questioning of the disciples as to the identity of the traitor which Luke gives at this point, presumably because he had already described it with greater particularity in words derived from a different tradition (xiv. 19). Matthew reproduces from Mark the saying about the Son of man, and then adds 'And Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Is it I, Rabbi ? He saith unto him, Thou hast said' (xxvi. 25). In position and to some extent in substance it represents the statement in Luke, 'And they began to question among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing' (xxii. 23), but as this is only another version of the statement in Mark, 'They began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I?' (xiv. 19), it is really a doublet of Matthew's version of this, 'And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began to say unto him every one, Is it I, Lord ?' (xxvi. 22), though by limiting the reference to Judas on the second occasion the evangelist has avoided mere repetition.

¹ Bab. *Chagigah*, M. ii. 1. Eng. trans. Streane.

² Bab. *Berakoth*, fol. 17a. Eng. trans. Cohen.

CHAPTER VIII

THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST

IN Luke, which, if our argument is correct, gives the Petrine tradition, the account of the institution of the eucharist is placed at the very beginning of the description of the events in the upper room the night before the crucifixion, and before the announcement of the betrayal : ‘ And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer : for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves : for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you : this do in remembrance of me. And

the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you. But behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table' (xxii. 14-21). At this point it will be sufficient to notice that 'Codex Bezae' and various Latin texts of the gospel omit the words, 'this do in remembrance of me . . . which is poured out for you.'

Mark's account differs widely in both substance and position, being placed at the end of what we are told about the events in the upper room. 'And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the mount of Olives' (xiv. 22-26). We notice at once that Mark mentions only one cup, not two as in Luke. St. Paul also in his first epistle to the Corinthians (xi. 23-25) gives an account of the institution of the eucharist in many

points very similar to that given in Luke, and he too speaks of only one cup. If we compare Luke's narrative and Paul's we see that the latter simply omits the account of the first cup, but otherwise repeats what we find in Luke. Mark's method is very different.

Mark evidently was very anxious not to discard any of the phraseology of the description of the first cup, though he omits all mention of our Lord's desire to eat the passover, for he fits practically the whole of it into his narrative, and his description of the one cup is a conflation of what Luke tells us about two cups. At the very beginning, before the announcement of the betrayal, Mark tells us that 'they were eating,' thus agreeing with Luke who says 'The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table,' though Luke places the announcement at a later point after the institution, while Mark apparently intends his statement, in part perhaps suggested by 'I have desired to eat this passover,' to lead up to and provide a proper setting for the reminiscence of the psalm (xl. (xli.) 9), 'even he that eateth with me,' which he has taken from the Johannine tradition. Before the institution he repeats the words 'as they were eating,' making it

plain that the taking of the bread was not the first action at the meal, agreeing thus in a measure with Luke who tells of the first cup before he mentions the bread, though probably the words are intended also as an equivalent to ‘after supper’ in Luke, which Mark omits. ‘He said, Take ye : this is my body’ is substituted for ‘saying, This is my body’ in Luke by a conflation with ‘he said, Take ye this’ in Luke’s account of the first cup, three successive words being identical in the Greek, though the grammar differs. ‘And he received a cup,’ ‘And the cup in like manner’ of Luke are combined in Mark’s ‘And he took a cup,’ the verb, ‘took,’ used in both Luke and Mark of the bread, ‘he took bread,’ being suggested by ‘in like manner,’ ‘He took bread . . . and the cup in like manner.’ The words ‘And when he had given thanks’ used in Luke of the first cup are utilised in Mark for the description of the one cup, though in importance this corresponds rather to the second cup of Luke. Instead of ‘he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves’ in Luke’s account of the first cup we read in Mark of the one cup, ‘he gave to them ; and they all drank of it.’ In substance the two differ but little. ‘He gave to them’ is repeated from the account

of the bread in both Luke and Mark, again apparently through the influence of ‘in like manner,’ ‘bread . . . he gave to them . . . and the cup in like manner,’ the words ‘he said, Take this’ being transferred, as we have seen, in Mark to the account of the bread. ‘And they all drank of it’ is a more obvious thing to say of a cup than ‘And divide it among yourselves.’ The latter indeed would be scarcely seemly if used of the ‘blood of the covenant.’ There is also the influence of the words which follow immediately in Luke, ‘for I say unto you, I will not drink,’ assimilation in the circumstances being very natural. The union in Mark of the two narratives which tell of the two cups in Luke has left an obvious suture, for as a result we are told that ‘they all drank of it’ before our Lord had given His explanation, ‘This is my blood of the covenant.’ In Matthew the difficulty is overcome by changing ‘they all drank of it’ into a command, and prefixing the word ‘saying,’ from the account of the second cup in Luke, which thus takes the place of ‘And he said unto them’ which follows in Mark, ‘And gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant’ (xxvi. 27–28). To introduce our Lord’s words with regard to the two cups

in Luke we find ‘and . . . he said,’ and ‘saying.’ Their combination in Mark gives ‘And he said unto them.’ Mark applies the principle of ‘in like manner’ even to our Lord’s explanation of the cup, so that ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood’ becomes ‘This is my blood of the covenant,’ being assimilated to ‘This is my body’ which is given in both Luke and Mark. Luke has ‘which is poured out for you,’ the reference being, as we see from the grammar, to the cup, but Mark ‘which is shed for many,’ referring perhaps to the blood, though the Greek for ‘poured out’ and ‘shed’ are identical. The text of Mark is assimilated to a saying belonging to the Jacobean tradition which he has utilised at an earlier point (x. 45), ‘The Son of man came . . . to give his life a ransom for many’; for ‘the blood is the life’ (Deut. xii. 23). ‘For many’ through the earlier passage is thus traceable to the description of the Servant of Jehovah in the second Isaiah (liii. 11–12). Mark’s ‘for many’ in the account of the eucharist has the same preposition as Luke’s ‘for you,’ but in the earlier passage (x. 45) the preposition is that used by Isaiah (liii. 12), Matthew using still another in his story of the institution. Matthew also adds ‘unto remission of sins’

(xxvi. 28), shewing that he has recognised the ultimate source of Mark's 'for many,' and drawn upon it again—' he bare the sins of many ' (Is. liii. 12). After bidding His disciples divide among themselves the first cup according to the Petrine tradition of Luke our Lord said, ' For I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.' The saying suits the context exactly. According to Mark, when delivering to them the one cup which He has identified with His blood, Jesus said, ' Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.' Placed after our Lord's declaration that the wine is His blood the words are quite inappropriate, for they speak of what we have just been told is 'the blood of the covenant,' as being again merely 'the fruit of the vine.' Mark conflates the saying about the fruit of the vine with another given by Luke, ' And I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom ' (xxii. 29-30). He transfers also the adjective 'new,' which in Luke describes the 'covenant,' to the wine which will be drunk in the kingdom of the

covenant, ‘I covenant unto you a kingdom, even as my Father covenanted unto me.’ In the first passage of Luke the reference is to the drinking of wine after the kingdom of God has come, that is, after the resurrection. St. Peter speaks of this to Cornelius, ‘God . . . gave him to be made manifest . . . to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead’ (Acts x. 40–41). In the second passage, however, the reference is to spiritual eating and drinking in the kingdom of God. Our Lord accepted the Jewish idea of the heavenly banquet, but gave it a spiritual meaning. The Jew said, ‘Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God’ (Luke xiv. 15). Jesus likewise said, ‘And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God’ (Luke xiii. 29). By his conflation of the two passages of Luke, Mark has confused the two thoughts. ‘I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine’ speaks of a materialistic drinking. ‘When I drink it new in the kingdom of God’ should refer to a spiritual drinking, but the first part of the saying makes this impossible. The secondary character of Mark is very evident. In Matthew the materialistic view of the feast of the kingdom is expressed even more

plainly than in Mark, for he speaks of ‘this fruit of the vine’ (xxvi. 29). The fact of the conflation of the two sayings as given in Luke is likewise more obvious, the thought of the disciples feasting with Jesus in the Father’s kingdom, though absent from the first of the two sayings in Luke and the parallel saying in Mark about the fruit of the vine, being prominent in the version of the corresponding saying in Matthew as in the second saying in Luke, ‘when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom,’ ‘I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.’

The account of the institution of the eucharist given in Matthew is in general agreement with that given in Mark, on which it is clearly based, differing widely from the account in Luke. The most important differences between Matthew and Mark we have already noticed. In addition we may mention that Matthew states explicitly that it was ‘Jesus’ Who took bread, thus differing from both Luke and Mark, probably because Judas had been mentioned in the previous verse, and that He gave it to ‘the disciples.’ By adding the word ‘eat’ in the command ‘Take, eat; this is my body,’ apparently to

balance the command ‘Drink ye,’ which, as we have seen, he has prefixed to our Lord’s words about the cup as given in the other gospels by changing the grammar of a statement in Mark, he has destroyed the sequence of words, ‘he said, Take ye: this,’ transferred from the first cup in Luke to the bread in Mark.

In Luke the account of the institution of the eucharist is put at the very beginning of the description of the events of the last supper. At the end he says: ‘And he came out, and went, as his custom was, unto the mount of Olives; and the disciples also followed him’ (xxii. 39). In Mark the account of the institution appears at the conclusion of what we are told about the proceedings in the upper room. Then we read, ‘And when they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the mount of Olives.’ Luke says nothing about the hymn, and so Mark must have had other information than that found in the Petrine tradition, and apparently is utilising that of James. In John we read: ‘These things spake Jesus; and lifting up his eyes to heaven, he said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that the Son may glorify thee. . . . When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth

with his disciples over the brook Kidron, where was a garden' (xvii. 1, xviii. 1). The hymn and the prayer apparently both formed part of the devotions with which the meal concluded in accordance with Jewish practice on important occasions, so that the two traditions are in agreement.

Mark, we have seen, is careful to fit in practically the whole of the phraseology used in Luke in connexion with the two cups into his account of the institution. It is therefore the more remarkable that he omits the important words found in Luke after the statement about the bread, 'This is my body,' which he repeats, 'which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.' Is it possible to discover a reason? We have noticed already that our Lord's mind at the last supper was dominated by thoughts derived from the Servant passages in the second Isaiah, 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.' The words of institution, 'This is my body, which is given for you,' express a similar thought. A comparison with the words used of the cup suggests that 'which is given for you' agrees primarily with 'this,' 'This is my body, even that which is given for you,' though evidently

intended to describe also the ‘body’ with which ‘this’ is identified. In the description of the Servant according to the Septuagint we read, ‘If ye give an offering for sin,’ but in the Hebrew, ‘If his soul should give an offering for sin’ (Is. liii. 10). The passage appears to be corrupt and the exact meaning uncertain. We notice however the word ‘give’ used of a sacrifice, though it is by no means common. In the Greek it appears in the psalter, though the Hebrew word is different, ‘If thou desiredst sacrifice, I would have given it: thou wilt not take pleasure in burnt offerings’ (l. (li.) 16). We compare with this verse, ‘Sacrifice and offering thou desiredst not; but a body hast thou prepared me: burnt offering and offering for sin thou didst not require’ (xxxix. (xl.) 6). If we combine the thoughts of the three passages, we see that the ‘desired’ sacrifice of the Servant which is ‘given’ for many is the sacrifice of his ‘body.’ We find thus the basis of the saying in which the giving of the bread and of the body are identified, ‘This is my body, which is given for you.’

Of the second cup according to Luke our Lord said, ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.’ The thought of the ‘covenant’ is

prominent in the description of the Servant, and more than once it appears in connexion with the idea of spiritual food. ‘I have given thee for a covenant of the people’ (Is. xlvi. 6). ‘I have given thee for a covenant of the people. . . . They shall be fed in all the ways. . . . They shall not hunger nor thirst’ (Is. xlix. 6, 9–10). ‘Ye that thirst, go to the water, and all that have no money, go and buy: and eat wine and fat without money or price. . . . Ye shall eat that which is good, and your soul shall feast itself on good things. . . . I will make with you an everlasting covenant. . . . I have given him a witness to the nations’ (Is. Iv. 1–4). The covenant of the Servant naturally suggests the new covenant spoken of by Jeremiah. ‘I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took hold of their hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt’ (xxxviii. (xxxii.) 31–32). At the inauguration of the old covenant at Sinai we read: ‘And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words. . . . And they did eat and drink’

(Exod. xxiv. 8, 11). Of the Servant in the Hebrew we are told, 'He poured out his life unto death' (Is. liii. 12). The 'life' is the blood which the Servant pours out in a sacrificial death. The thought is that of Deuteronomy, 'The blood is the life of it; . . . ye shall pour it out upon the earth as water. . . . The blood of thy sacrifices thou shalt pour out at the foot of the altar of the Lord thy God' (xii. 23-24, 27). In later days, however, the libation of wine, not the pouring of the blood, was the climax of a sacrifice. We read of Simon the son of Onias: 'He stretched out his hand to the cup, and poured a libation of the blood of the grape; he poured out at the foot of the altar a sweet-smelling savour unto the Most High, the King of all' (Ecclus. 1. 15). It is in the light of these passages that we understand our Lord's words as recorded in Luke: 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.' Grammatically we see that it is the cup which is poured out, not the blood, though apparently the intention is that the subordinate clause should refer to both. The pouring out of the wine represents the pouring out in sacrifice of the blood of Jesus, Who identifies Himself with the Servant of Jehovah, thus inaugu-

rating a new covenant. We may perhaps compare the ancient custom of the Greeks, who in making a covenant poured out a solemn drink offering of wine, though here the pouring out is into the cup, not from it.

After His statement about the bread Jesus said according to Luke, ‘This do for my memorial.’ A memorial and a covenant are closely connected in the law concerning the shewbread in Leviticus. In the Septuagint we read: ‘And ye shall put pure frankincense and salt upon each pile, and they shall be to the loaves for a memorial, set forth before the Lord . . . an everlasting covenant’ (xxiv. 7–8). The Hebrew word translated ‘memorial’ is used in the Old Testament to describe the handful of fine flour, oil, and frankincense which in a meal offering is burnt upon the altar (Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16, v. 12, vi. 15 (8); Num. v. 26; Eccl. xxxviii. 11, xlvi. 16), as well as the frankincense put upon the shewbread, which is likewise burnt. The frankincense and salt are indeed to the shewbread what the memorial of fine flour, oil, and frankincense is to the meal offering, and serve the same purpose. In the Septuagint two Greek words are used to translate the one Hebrew word, that used in the account of the institution of the eucharist in

Luke appearing only in the law with regard to the shewbread.

Two particular types of covenant are mentioned in the Old Testament, the covenant of blood (*Exod. xxiv. 8*; *Zech. ix. 11*), and the covenant of salt (*Lev. ii. 13*; *Num. xviii. 19*; *2 Chron. xiii. 5*). A covenant of blood is founded upon an animal sacrifice, God Himself being a party to the agreement. Of this kind was the covenant between Jehovah and Israel, inaugurated at Sinai (*Exod. xxiv. 8*), but renewed every time sacrifice was offered (*Ps. xlix. (l.) 5*), when at ‘the table of the Lord’ (*Mal. i. 7, 12*), or altar, God and man were together partakers of ‘the food of the offering’ (*Lev. iii. 11, Heb.*), the ‘meat’ (*Mal. i. 12*), or ‘bread of God’ (*Lev. xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22; xxii. 25, Heb.*), God’s share of the ‘bread’ being ‘the fat and the blood’ (*Ezek. xliv. 7*), the latter being ‘the blood of the covenant’ (*Zech. ix. 11*). The covenant of salt is founded on a meal taken in common, or the partaking by one man of the food of another (cf. *Gen. xxxi. 46–48, Jos. ix. 14–15*). In the Hebrew of Ezra we read: ‘We eat the salt of the palace, and it is not meet for us to see the king’s dishonour’ (*iv. 14*). That this type of covenant might exist between God

and man, salt was made a necessary ingredient of every meal offering, as we read in Leviticus: ‘ And every oblation of thy meal offering shalt thou season with salt ; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meal offering : with all thine oblations thou shalt offer salt ’ (ii. 13, Heb.). For the same reason apparently, according to the Hebrew, the incense was ‘ seasoned with salt ’ (Exod. xxx. 35), and salt as well as frankincense, according to the Septuagint, placed on the piles of shewbread (Lev. xxiv. 7). Thus God and man were both partakers of ‘ the pure table ’ (Lev. xxiv. 6). The purpose of a sacrifice was to remind God of the covenant and so to renew it (Exod. xxiv. 8 ; Ps. xlix. (l.) 5 ; Zech. ix. 11). The belief that Jehovah would remember His covenant was the basis of Jewish religion. The phrase ‘ remember the covenant ’ occurs no fewer than fifteen times in the Old Testament (Gen. ix. 15, 16 ; Exod. ii. 24, vi. 5 ; Lev. xxvi. 42 *bis*, 45 ; Ps. civ. (cv.) 8, cv. (cvi.) 45, cx. (cxi.) 5 ; Ezek. xvi. 60 ; Amos i. 9 ; Eccl. xxviii. 7 ; 1 Macc. iv. 10 ; 2 Macc. i. 2), all but two referring to God, and once in the New Testament (Luke i. 72), also referring to God. We have thus an explanation of the memorial

of a meal offering ; it reminded God of the covenant between Himself and Israel, and indeed renewed it as a covenant of salt, the frankincense and salt which were ‘for a memorial’ serving the same purpose in the case of the shewbread, ‘an everlasting covenant.’ So the purpose of a sacrifice was to remind God of the covenant, and as a recognition and renewal of this each sacrifice was offered. The meaning of our Lord’s words, ‘This do for my memorial,’ is therefore apparent. The action of the eucharist is performed (‘This do’), and the bread (‘This is my body’) taken, as a reminder to God (‘for my memorial’) of the covenant (‘the new covenant’) inaugurated by the sacrifice of Jesus (‘in my blood’), as a recognition and renewal of which the bread is offered to God in thanksgiving (‘when he had given thanks’).

As Mark shortens the account of the institution given by Luke by both omission and conflation, it is not surprising that he omits the words, ‘which is given for you,’ used of the bread, but gives ‘which is shed for many,’ in the saying about the cup, one presumably being regarded as included in the other, since ‘it is the blood that maketh atonement’ (Lev. xvii. 11, Heb.). ‘This do for my

'memorial' is probably omitted for a similar reason, because it is regarded as included in the reference to the covenant, 'This is my blood of the covenant.' We notice that the adjective 'new' has disappeared from the description of the covenant, being transferred, as we have seen, to the fruit of the vine which will be drunk 'new' in the kingdom of God. As a result, the words spoken of the cup are almost identical with those used by Moses at the inauguration of the old covenant at Sinai, 'This is my blood of the covenant,' 'Behold, the blood of the covenant.' As 'the blood of the covenant' in one type of sacrifice serves the same purpose as the memorial with 'the salt of the covenant' in the other, the ratification of the original covenant, there is no need to mention both. Though in Mark there is no command to that effect, an assumption of the repetition of the ordinance is involved in the reference to the covenant, just as the repetition or renewal of the covenant sacrifice of Sinai in every Jewish sacrifice was regarded as following from the fact that that sacrifice inaugurating a covenant had been offered.

Our investigation surely leaves no room for doubt that the narrative of Mark is secondary. It would be quite impossible on

the assumption that Mark is primary to explain the account of the institution in Luke either in general outline or in detail. Mark, however, can be explained only as an edited version of the longer text in Luke. It is no part of the purpose of this essay to discuss problems of textual criticism, but the authenticity of this longer text follows as a matter of course if the result of our argument is correct. The shorter text found in certain manuscripts must therefore be the result of some later revision, which need not be discussed here.

For the institution of the eucharist we have not only the narratives of the Synoptic gospels, but an account given by St. Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians. ‘The Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me’ (xi. 23–25). We notice at once the close agreement with the account given in Luke, though as in Mark he mentions but one cup. Yet whereas Mark reduces the two cups to

one by conflating what is said about the two into one statement, St. Paul has adopted the simpler expedient of omitting the reference to the first cup in Luke altogether. It will be useful to compare the accounts of Luke and Paul in detail. Luke speaks of Jesus ‘taking bread,’ but Paul says ‘he took bread,’ the difference being due to the manner of Paul’s introduction. Consequently Paul has need of ‘and’ to connect two finite verbs. Instead of Luke’s ‘he gave to them, saying’ Paul has simply ‘he said.’ The words ‘This is my body’ are given in a different order. Instead of ‘which is given for you’ the apostle has only ‘which is for you,’ the omission of ‘given’ corresponding with the earlier omission of ‘he gave,’ suggesting the connexion between the two which we recognised above. ‘Which is for you’ is comparable with ‘which is for the people’ in the description of the day of atonement in Leviticus. ‘And he shall kill the goat of the sin offering, which is for the people’ (xvi. 15). ‘In like manner also the cup, after supper’ differs from Luke only in the order of the words. In the words about the cup Paul gives the word ‘is’ which is not expressed in Luke, saying also ‘my blood’ instead of ‘the blood of me’ as in Luke. Paul omits

altogether the words ‘even that which is poured out for you,’ giving in their place ‘this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me,’ a repetition of the command given according to Luke after the words concerning the bread, with an addition adapting it to the cup, somewhat unnecessarily as he gives the words about the covenant, and also rather inappropriately in view of the history of the word ‘memorial,’ though it is but a further extension of the original meaning of the word, which had begun even in the use of the word as given in Luke. We note the even distribution of agreement and disagreement with Luke’s account throughout the whole of the narrative, and there is no difference in this respect between the part paralleled in the shorter text of Luke and the part paralleled only in the longer. There is therefore no reason, based on verbal agreement of text, why the added words of the longer version of the narrative should be regarded as founded on Paul’s account, and not the part common to both forms of text. If the additional matter of the longer text be regarded as derived from Paul, the equally close agreement in the common part is left entirely without explanation, so that we have confirmation of the authenticity of

the longer text. If Paul's account be a later version of the longer text of Luke, the agreement between his narrative and Luke's in both parts is naturally and quite adequately explained. Between Paul's account and Mark's there is considerable difference, though both have much in common with Luke, and each could be explained as a separate development from the tradition he records. We notice that Mark omits 'which is given for you,' but Paul 'even that which is poured out for you'; also that Mark omits 'This do for my memorial,' whereas Paul gives it twice. The priority of the tradition recorded in Luke explains both.

CHAPTER IX

THE ARREST OF JESUS

THE accounts of our Lord's arrest afford a good example of Mark's method of combining parallel narratives. Luke says : ‘ While he yet spake, behold, a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them ; and he drew near unto Jesus to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss ? . . . And Jesus said unto the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders, which were come against him, Are ye come out, as against a robber, with swords and staves ? ’ (xxii. 47–48, 52). John says : ‘ Judas then, having received the band of soldiers, and officers from the chief priests and the Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons. Jesus therefore, knowing all the things that were coming upon him, went forth, and saith unto them, Whom seek ye ? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, was standing with them ’

(xviii. 3-5). Mark says : ‘ And straightway, while he yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. Now he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he ; take him, and lead him away safely. And when he was come, straightway he came to him, and saith, Rabbi ; and kissed him. And they laid hands on him, and took him ’ (xiv. 43-46).

Mark’s narrative appears to be a conflation of the tradition recorded in Luke with another similar to that found in John. ‘ And with him a multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders ’ agrees in substance with ‘ Having received the band of soldiers, and officers from the chief priests and the Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons,’ though the phraseology is largely that of Luke, who has ‘ the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders ’ and ‘ with swords and staves,’ Luke stating, however, that ‘ the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders ’ themselves made the arrest. Mark substitutes ‘ the scribes ’ for ‘ captains of the temple.’ We read in the

Talmud of the latter, ‘The ruler of the mountain of the temple takes his walks through every watch with torches lighted before him: and if he found any . . . sleeping, he struck him with a stick.’¹ We note the staves and torches of the different traditions. ‘He that betrayed him’ in Mark repeats ‘which betrayed him’ of John. The compact between Judas and the chief priests about the kiss may be derived from another tradition, but it is possible that it is merely an interpretative addition, for it is difficult to imagine what evidence there could have been for the statement. ‘Rabbi,’ as in the story of the Transfiguration (ix. 5), is probably editorial, though it may be taken from another tradition. Mark omits the question Jesus puts to Judas. We notice in Luke, ‘he drew near,’ ‘betrayest thou the Son of man,’ phraseology which Mark puts earlier, ‘He that betrayeth me is at hand [hath drawn near],’ in a passage (xiv. 41–42), in which Mark makes an addition to Luke by conflating material from different traditions, and particularly sayings belonging properly to the end of the proceedings in the upper room according to John, ‘the hour is come’ (xvii. 1, cf. xiii. 1), ‘Arise, let us go’ (xiv. 31).

¹ *Middoth*, i. 2. See Lightfoot, *Works*, xii. p. 191.

The Petrine and Johannine traditions agree in saying that the incident of the cutting off of the servant's ear took place before they 'seized' Jesus, though Mark says 'they laid hands on him, and took him' before he records the action. Mark apparently is using a different tradition which he is fitting into the framework found in Luke. The same conclusion follows from the different accounts of this incident. Luke says: 'And a certain one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his right ear' (xxii. 50). John says: 'Simon Peter therefore having a sword drew it, and struck the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear' (xviii. 10). Mark says: 'But a certain one of them that stood by drew his sword, and smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear' (xiv. 47). The three accounts are very similar, but Mark agrees with John in mentioning the drawing of the sword, though he uses a different word. The words translated 'smote' and 'ear' in Mark are those used by John. Again Mark seems to be conflating the different traditions, though rather oddly he omits the statement that it was the right ear, found in Luke and John. Mark says nothing about any words of Jesus after the incident; but as he introduces the

saying to the ‘multitude’ with the words ‘And Jesus answered and said,’ used in Luke of the words said in connexion with the action, he seems to have known them but omitted them. Luke alone speaks of the cure of the servant’s ear, ‘And he touched his ear, and healed him’ (xxii. 51). If the event really happened it is curious that there is no mention of it in any of the other gospels. In John we read : ‘Jesus therefore said unto Peter, Put up the sword into the sheath’ (xviii. 11), and in Matthew, ‘Then saith Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into its place’ (xxvi. 52), evidently two versions of a quite different tradition. The suggestion that Luke, or his authority, has misunderstood our Lord’s saying is not improbable, particularly as the same Greek word, not however the word used here, might be used of restoring the sword to its place or the ear. We notice earlier in Luke : ‘His hand was restored’ (vi. 10), and in Jeremiah, ‘O sword of the Lord . . . be restored to thy scabbard’ (xxix. (xlvii.) 6).¹ Elsewhere, as in our Lord’s saying about humility, we have seen reason to believe that Matthew has preserved an earlier version of a tradition than Luke,²

¹ See Abbott in *Classical Review*, vol. vii. (Dec. 1893), p. 443.

² See pp. 139–140.

so that the same may be true here. The conjunction of touching and healing is found twice in other contexts in Luke, ‘ And all the multitude sought to touch him : for power came forth from him, and healed them all ’ (vi. 19), ‘ She touched him, and . . . was healed immediately ’ (viii. 47), the latter being reproduced in Mark (v. 27–29), but with a less obvious connexion between the words, so that the statement about the cure is a not unlikely addition to the tradition, as an equivalent to words of our Lord misunderstood in the course of transmission. John, we note, though he speaks of ‘ Cana of Galilee, where he made the water wine ’ (iv. 46), ‘ Lazarus, whom Jesus raised from the dead ’ (xii. 1), yet says only ‘ a kinsman of him whose ear Peter cut off ’ (xviii. 26), making no mention of the miracle, of which therefore he was presumably not aware. We might have expected Mark to conflate the two traditions of the healing of the ear and of the command to put the sword into the sheath, but he omits both, with the result that there is a certain lack of connexion in the narrative, the words ‘ Jesus answered and said ’ being suitable when He is addressing the disciples after the cutting off of the ear, as in Luke, but less suitable when He is

speaking to the ‘multitude,’ who had done nothing requiring an answer, though indeed Mark has a similar use of the word ‘answer’ elsewhere (ix. 5, x. 51, xi. 14, xii. 35). In Mark the words can only refer back to ‘they laid hands on him, and took him,’ though His answer assumes, as in Luke, that the arrest has yet to take place, ‘Are ye come out . . . to seize me?’

The remonstrance Jesus addressed to those who were arresting Him ended, according to Luke, with the words ‘But this is your hour, and the power of darkness’ (xxii. 53), exactly suited to the occasion. In Mark we read, ‘But that the scriptures might be fulfilled’ (xiv. 49). It is difficult to imagine such words used to the chief priests and others who were seizing Jesus. The sentence is taken from John, ‘I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me’ (xiii. 18). The elliptic ‘but that’ is a characteristic of the fourth gospel (i. 8, ix. 3, xiii. 18). Luke’s conclusion of our Lord’s saying reminds us of what we read in John: ‘He then having received the sop went out straightway: and it was night. . . . Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered, every

man to his own, and shall leave me alone' (xiii. 30, xvi. 32). After the words which in John refer to the treachery of Judas, Mark likewise tells of the flight of the rest of the apostles, 'And they all left him, and fled' (xiv. 50), though as it stands, evidently a result of conflation, the statement might be taken to refer to the chief priests and others who had come to arrest Jesus, and not to the disciples, who are not mentioned in the context. In John we read, 'They went backward, and fell to the ground,' and later, 'Let these go their way' (xviii. 6, 8), possibly therefore a combination of two interpretations of one original statement. The words, 'And they all left him, and fled,' taken in conjunction with the prediction of the flight, 'The sheep shall be scattered abroad' (Mark xiv. 27), provide a remarkable parallel to the phraseology of John. Yet, as they clearly belong to a different line of tradition, they must be derived, it would seem, from the Jacobean narrative, a conclusion already reached with respect to the prophecy of the flight on other grounds. The evidence therefore seems to leave little room for doubt that Mark's account is a mosaic formed of elements from each of the three lines of evangelical tradition, from Peter, James, and John.

Mark next gives us a passage peculiar to the second gospel. ‘And a certain young man followed with him, having a linen cloth cast about him, over his naked body : and they lay hold on him ; but he left the linen cloth, and fled naked’ (xiv. 51–52). We cannot consider it apart from a statement which follows: ‘And Peter had followed him afar off’ (xiv. 54). Luke merely gives a parallel to this: ‘But Peter followed afar off’ (xxii. 54). In John we read: ‘And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple’ (xviii. 15). In view of Mark’s frequent use of the Johannine and a parallel, presumably the Jacobean, tradition there can be little doubt that the ‘young man’ and the ‘other disciple’ are properly identical. The change is very extraordinary, though by no means unparalleled in the gospel, and is to be explained as development by accretion. We may compare the statement in Amos according to the Hebrew. ‘And he that is courageous among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day’ (ii. 16). It is however the story of Joseph which has supplied most of the details. In Genesis we read: ‘And there was with us there a young man’ (xli. 12), ‘And she caught hold of him by his garments . . . and he left his

garments in her hand, and fled' (xxxix. 12). The closest parallel is to be found in the Testament of Joseph: 'When I saw that . . . she was laying hold of my garment, I left it, and fled naked' (viii. 3). Here, too, he is described as a 'young man,' 'Let the young man be brought' (xiii. 4). The Greek being largely identical it would seem to be impossible to deny a literary connexion. The remainder of the passage, 'clothed with linen over the naked [body],' is found in the Septuagint, 'to be clothed with linen' (1 Macc. xiv. 44, A), 'If thou seest the naked, clothe him' (Is. lviii. 7), 'The men . . . clothed all the naked' (2 Chron. xxviii. 15), 'The man who . . . shall clothe the naked' (Ezek. xviii. 5, 7, cf. 16). Yet, in spite of its mosaic character, the phraseology of the passage is essentially Markan, and the influences which have been at work determining the vocabulary are not really different from those to be recognised elsewhere in the gospel, modifying the tradition not infrequently quite apart from the consciousness of the person responsible. The nucleus of the story was derived apparently from the Jacobean line of tradition, for the Petrine narrative says nothing about the following of anyone but Peter, and the Johannine makes no

distinction of near or far in recording the fact that the two disciples followed Jesus. The Jacobean tradition being as a rule the most primitive, the accretion possibly took place after the combination of elements of the three traditions to form the original version of the second gospel.

CHAPTER X

IN THE HIGH PRIEST'S PALACE

THERE is perhaps no passage in which Mark's method of compiling his gospel is to be seen with greater clearness, than in his account of the events in the high priest's palace. In Luke we read : ‘ And they seized him, and led him away, and brought him into the high priest's house. But Peter followed afar off. And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the court, and had sat down together, Peter sat in the midst of them. . . . And the men that held Jesus mocked him, and beat him. And they blindfolded him, and asked him, saying, Prophesy : who is he that struck thee ? And many other things spake they against him, reviling him. And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes ; and they led him away into their council, saying, If thou art the Christ, tell us. But he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe :

and if I ask you, ye will not answer. But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God. And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God ? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What further need have we of witness ? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth ' (xxii. 54-55, 63-71). In Mark we read : ' And they laid hands on him, and took him. . . . And they led Jesus away to the high priest : and there come together with him all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes. And Peter had followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest ; and he was sitting with the officers, and warming himself in the light of the fire. Now the chief priests and the whole council sought witness against Jesus to put him to death ; and found it not. For many bare false witness against him, and their witness agreed not together. And there stood up certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands. And not even so did their witness agree together. And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing ? what is it

which these witness against thee ? But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked him, and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed ? And Jesus said, I am : and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven. And the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What further need have we of witnesses ? Ye have heard the blasphemy : what think ye ? And they all condemned him to be worthy of death. And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy : and the officers received him with blows of rods ' (xiv. 46, 53–65).

We have already noticed that Mark has displaced the arrest, ' And they laid hands on him, and took him,' putting it before the incident of the cutting off of the servant's ear, though in Luke, more naturally, it is placed afterwards, ' And they seized him, and led him away,' and likewise in John, ' So the band and the chief captain, and the officers of the Jews, seized Jesus and bound him, and led him to Annas first ' (xviii. 12–13). Mark's words, ' And they led Jesus away to the high priest : and there come together all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes,' are a

conflation of two different passages in Luke, ‘And they led him away, and brought him into the high priest’s house,’ and ‘And . . . the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council.’ The verb used in Mark, ‘they led away,’ is that which is found in the second passage of Luke. ‘To the high priest’ in Mark is the equivalent of both ‘into the high priest’s house,’ and ‘into their council.’ Matthew gives a modification of Mark, identifying the high priest with Caiaphas, and stating that the scribes and elders were already assembled in readiness with him. ‘And they that had taken Jesus led him away to the house of Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were gathered together’ (xxvi. 57). He says nothing about the chief priests. John agrees with Luke in saying nothing about the council at this point, ‘And they led him to Annas first; for he was father in law to Caiaphas, which was high priest that year’ (xviii. 13). The original form of the narrative clearly said nothing about an assembly of the council until ‘it was day,’ so that there is a presumption that John is likewise right in saying Jesus was taken to Annas, not to Caiaphas.

Mark continues : ‘ And Peter had followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest ; and he was sitting with the officers, and warming himself in the light of the fire,’ reproducing Luke’s account, ‘ But Peter followed afar off. And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the court, and had sat down together, Peter sat in the midst of them,’ with words from his description of the first denial, ‘ as he sat in the light of the fire ’ (xxii. 56), adding also phraseology from the account in John, ‘ into the court of the high priest,’ ‘ the officers,’ ‘ warming himself,’ and so to some extent modifying Luke. The word ‘ within ’ seems to have been suggested by the statement in John that Peter first of all stood ‘ without.’ John says : ‘ And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple. Now that disciple was known unto the high priest, and entered in with Jesus into the court of the high priest ; but Peter was standing at the door without. So the other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, went out and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter. . . . Now the servants and the officers were standing there, having made a fire of coals ; for it was cold ; and they were warming themselves : and Peter also was with them,

standing and warming himself' (xviii. 15–16, 18). Matthew gives a modification of Mark, omitting and changing some of the phraseology from John, 'But Peter followed him afar off, unto the court of the high priest, and entered in, and sat with the officers, to see the end' (xxvi. 58).

The next passage in Mark is not represented in Luke or John. 'Now the chief priests and the whole council sought witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found it not. For many bare false witness against him, and their witness agreed not together. And there stood up certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands. And not even so did their witness agree together.' John gives a quite different tradition with regard to the events within the high priest's palace: 'The high priest therefore asked Jesus of his disciples, and of his teaching. Jesus answered him, I have spoken openly to the world; I ever taught in synagogues, and in the temple, where all the Jews come together; and in secret spake I nothing. Why askest thou me? ask them that have heard me, what I spake unto them:

behold, these know the things which I said. And when he had said this, one of the officers standing by gave Jesus a blow of a rod, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so ? Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil : but if well, why smitest thou me ? Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest ' (xviii. 19-24).

The questioning before Annas was evidently an attempt to find evidence, but it is something very different from the search for witnesses on the part of ' the whole council ' described in Mark, and both traditions cannot well be correct. Peter, we note, was standing with the servants by the fire, and was hardly in a position to make a report on what took place in the high priest's presence. Indeed nothing is said about it in the tradition recorded in Luke which we have seen reason to believe derived from Peter. ' The other disciple, which was known unto the high priest ' is the only person mentioned who could tell what took place, and doubtless it is his account which is found in John. How, then, are we to explain the tradition given in Mark ? The key to the solution of the problem is to be found in a statement of Luke : ' The assembly of the elders of the people

was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes ; and they led him away into their council. . . . And they said, What further need have we of witness ?' The meaning clearly is that after our Lord's confession that He was the Son of God, no further evidence was necessary, not that a search for witnesses, so far in vain, might now cease. Yet Mark has so understood it, ' What further need have we of witnesses ?' and, apparently on the strength of the statement in Luke that ' they said ' this, has ascribed it to the ' chief priests and scribes,' who formed the ' council,' so that he tells us ' Now the chief priests and the whole council sought witness against Jesus to put him to death ; and found it not.' We notice how a form of statement which Mark has taken over from the tradition given in Luke is imitated. ' But the chief priests and the scribes and the principal men of the people sought to destroy him ' (xix. 47; cf. Mark xi. 18), ' And the scribes and the chief priests sought to lay hands on him ' (xx. 19; cf. Mark xii. 12), ' And the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might put him to death ' (xxii. 2 ; cf. Mark xiv. 1). The law with regard to witnesses is found in Deuteronomy, ' One witness shall not remain to witness against a man for any iniquity . . . ;

at the mouth of two witnesses, and at the mouth of three witnesses, shall every word be established. And if an unrighteous witness rise up against a man, alleging wrong doing against him, then the two men, between whom the controversy is, shall stand before the Lord' (xix. 15-17). The council evidently had this passage in mind when they put the question, 'What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth.' The two or three could be provided in the council itself. On the assumption of such an enquiry as Mark supposes the lack of agreement between two or three would suggest the giving of false testimony. Speaking of differences between the statements of witnesses the Talmud says: 'Where they contradict each other's evidence, their evidence is worthless.'¹ What therefore was implicit in the high priest's saying, as he understood it, Mark makes explicit, 'For many witnessed falsely against him, and their witness agreed not together.' The ninth commandment and a saying of the Talmud lie behind the statement apparently. 'Thou shalt not falsely witness false witness against thy neighbour' (Exod. xx. 16; Deut. v. 20), 'The evidence of witnesses . . . is

¹ *Sanh.*, M. v. 2. Eng. trans. Danby (S.P.C.K.).

invalid when the two witnesses do not agree. Their evidence is only regarded as upheld when the two are as one.¹ Though the assumption of the existence of many false witnesses was a necessary consequence of his misunderstanding, it is not easy to see where Mark thought many witnesses would be found in the middle of the night, or why, if someone had taken the trouble to assemble them, he had not selected at least two or three whose testimony would agree. In Matthew the echoes of both commandment and Talmud have practically disappeared, and the difficulties of the statement are further enhanced, the council, we are told, deliberately seeking false witnesses, ‘Now the chief priests and the whole council sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death ; and they found it not, though many false witnesses came’ (xxvi. 59–60).

At first sight it seems somewhat extraordinary that Mark after telling of the many who bare false witness to no purpose should think it worth while to mention a particular example which was equally futile, ‘And there stood up certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands,

¹ *Sanh.*, T. v. 5b.

and in three days I will build another made without hands. And not even so did their witness agree together.' As the particular saying of Jesus, though recorded in John, is not given in Mark, the gospel affords no reason why this particular piece of false witness should be singled out, nor indeed an explanation of what constituted the false witness, or whether Jesus had said some such words or not. The difficulty is solved only when we read the history of the early church in Acts. In Stephen's speech we read : 'The Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands' (vii. 48). The adjective 'made with hands' occurs fourteen times in the Septuagint (Lev. xxvi. 1, 30 ; Is. ii. 18, x. 11, xvi. 12, xix. 1, xxi. 9, xxxi. 7, xlvi. 6 ; Dan. v. 4, 23, vi. 27 (28); Judith viii. 18; Wis. xiv. 8), but it is always used of idols. Stephen uses it of temples, including the temple at Jerusalem, and it is to this that it is applied in Mark. The word is evidently an interpretative addition in Mark, for it does not occur in the saying as recorded in John : 'Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. The Jews therefore said, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou raise it up in three days ? But he spake

of the temple of his body. When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he spake this' (ii. 19-22). The word is thus not our Lord's, but an echo of the controversy about Stephen. Indeed, the whole passage in Mark is due to a reading back into the life of Jesus a dispute belonging to the primitive church which arose in consequence of the preaching of Stephen. 'And they stirred up the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon him, and seized him, and brought him into the council, and set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak words against this holy place, and the law : for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us' (Acts vi. 12-14). So far as the temple is concerned the accusation is exactly the same as that brought by other false witnesses against Jesus according to Mark. The statement that 'this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place' is clearly based on a saying of Jesus, which can be none other than that recorded by John, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,' the change from 'Destroy this temple' to 'I will destroy this temple' constituting the falsehood. Mark,

who, as we have seen, was acquainted with and freely utilised elements of the tradition derived from John, recognised the saying the enemies of Stephen had in mind, and concluded that a like false charge must have been made against Jesus, and accordingly incorporated it in his gospel. In view of the literary methods of the second evangelist in other places such a transference of accusation is not particularly surprising. The description 'made without hands' can scarcely be part of the saying spoken by Jesus, being used by Stephen merely to summarise words from the third Isaiah. 'Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands ; as saith the prophet, The heaven is my throne, And the earth the footstool of my feet : What manner of house will ye build me ? saith the Lord : Or what is the place of my rest ? Did not my hand make all these things ?' (Acts vii. 48-50 ; cf. Is. lxvi. 1-2). Yet Mark includes it in the saying put into the mouth of the false witnesses. That the story of Stephen suggested the similar accusation against Jesus recorded in the second gospel seems to be beyond dispute.

The words, 'And there stood up certain, and bare false witness,' are perhaps reminiscent of the psalter, 'Unrighteous witnesses

stood up against me' (xxvi. (xxvii.) 12), 'Unrighteous witnesses stood up, and asked me of things that I knew not' (xxxiv. (xxxv.) 11). We remember also the words of the Talmud, 'Men must stand when they . . . bear witness.'¹ In the statement as a whole, 'And there stood up certain, and bare false witness against him. . . . And not even so did their witness agree together,' we notice again echoes both of the ninth commandment and of the Talmud.

Mark gives the saying a second time in his description of the mocking at the cross. 'And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ha ! thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross. In like manner also the chief priests mocking him among themselves with the scribes said, He saved others ; himself he cannot save. Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe' (xv. 29–32). The whole passage is composite, and is an expansion of what we find in Luke. 'And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also scoffed at him, saying, He saved others ; let him save himself, if this is the Christ of God,

¹ *Sanh.*, T. vi. 2.

his chosen' (xxiii. 35). Instead of the two reminiscences of Psalm xxi. (xxii.) 7 in Luke, 'beholding,' 'scoffed at him,' Mark gives another, 'wagging their heads,' from the same verse, 'All that beheld me scoffed at me: they spake with their lips, they wagged the head,' expanding it however by assimilating it to a longer form of the same statement in Lamentations, 'All that passed by . . . wagged their head' (ii. 15). The words, 'and saying . . . save thyself,' which describe the railing of those who passed by in Mark, are used of the mocking of the soldiers in Luke, 'And the soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, offering him vinegar, and saying, If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself' (xxiii. 36-37). We have thus another example of the transference of narrative, comparable with the transference of the false accusations against Stephen to our Lord. The words, 'and come down from the cross,' are an interpretative addition explaining 'save thyself.' The second reminiscence of Psalm xxi. (xxii.) 7, 'scoffed at him,' in Luke is lost in Mark, for we read only of the chief priests 'mocking him.' 'Let him save himself' in Luke has become 'himself he cannot save,' a definite denial. The explanatory words 'come down from the

cross' are given a second time in Mark, with the addition, 'that we may see and believe,' a thought barely implicit in Luke. The bulk of the passage in Mark is thus explained as a development from what we find in Luke, but Luke has nothing even remotely suggesting, 'Ha ! thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days.' Again we must conclude that it is an addition of the evangelist in amplification of the simpler statement found in Luke. Mark's first use of the saying can be explained as a transference of what is recorded of Stephen to Jesus, but in the present instance no such explanation is possible. It is however obviously intended as evidence of a continuation of the attitude towards our Lord's teaching which reached a climax later in the controversy raised by Stephen. We note that the statement about the saying in the fourth gospel, which we have seen reason to believe reliable as an authority, seems to preclude the authenticity of its quotation in the high priest's palace and at the cross, 'When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he spake this' (ii. 22). If the false witnesses and mockers at the cross could remember that Jesus had so spoken, it is curious that His disciples should have

forgotten, while it is still more odd that the disciples should remember that the saying had twice been quoted against Him as a saying of Jesus, and yet they themselves did not remember He had spoken it until after the resurrection. We conclude rather that the saying was not quoted by false witnesses or mockers, but that the statements to that effect are editorial additions of Mark, expanding the earlier tradition recorded in Luke from which they are absent.

Matthew in his version of the narrative follows Mark in both contexts, but on each occasion carries the development of text further, as is his wont. We read : ‘ But afterward came two, and said, This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days ’ (xxvi. 60–61). We notice the disappearance of the epithets ‘ made with hands,’ ‘ made without hands,’ which in Mark connect the saying with Stephen’s speech and gave the hint about the origin of the insertion of the passage in the second gospel. The echoes of the ninth commandment and the Talmud have likewise gone, and even the phraseology which suggests the references to the standing up of false witnesses in the psalter. Instead of these we find reminiscences of other Old Testament

passages describing similar scenes, 'And two men, sons of Belial, came in . . . and bare witness against him' (3 (1) Kings xx. (xxi.) 13), 'And the men of Belial . . . that they might put her to death . . . came to the assembly of the city . . . And the two elders and judges stood up' (Sus. 28-29). The law of Deuteronomy required at least two or three witnesses, and Mark speaks only of 'certain,' so that the reason for 'two' in Matthew is hardly doubtful. The two witnesses, against both Naboth and Susanna, 'came,' and this is the verb in Matthew, by assimilation, apparently, in the previous sentence also as well as in that under discussion. Matthew changes 'We heard him say' to 'This man said,' nothing now being mentioned whether they heard the saying themselves, though the rule of the Talmud is plain, 'The evidence of witnesses is not regarded as valid unless they have actually seen what they assert.'¹ Our Lord's saying has become merely a statement of power, not of intention, 'I am able to destroy' not 'I will destroy.' 'This temple,' the phrase used in John and Mark, is altered to 'the temple of God,' an expression not found elsewhere in the gospels. On the version of the saying in

¹ *Sanh.*, T. v. 5b.

Matthew it would seem to be difficult to base any legal charge whatsoever, yet the finding of these two witnesses according to the first gospel brings the council's search for witness to a successful conclusion, Mark's statement that even this testimony did not agree together being omitted.

The author of the first gospel makes no change in the text of our Lord's saying as inaccurately quoted in the alleged taunt at the cross, though he adds words to the context. 'Save thyself' becomes 'Save thyself : if thou art the Son of God,' confirming our conclusion that by the addition of these words Mark has conflated the mocking of the people and that of the soldiers, as reported in Luke, where we read, 'And the soldiers also mocked him . . . saying, If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself,' Matthew's saying being evidently a modification of this. At the end of the taunt of the chief priests and scribes as given in Mark, the first gospel adds : 'He trusteth on God ; let him deliver him now, if he desireth him : for he said, I am the Son of God ' (xxvii. 43), again utilising the words of the twenty-first (second) psalm : 'He hoped on the Lord ; let him deliver him : let him save him because he desireth him ' (xxi. (xxii.) 8). That a verse

of the psalter was used in this way by the priests and scribes is highly improbable, and indeed if we remember the rest of the psalm, it would have been derogatory to themselves rather than to Jesus. We have rather the result of the meditation of the evangelist put in historical form. The next words, ‘For he said, I am the Son of God,’ which explain the quotation from the psalm, correspond in the saying of the chief priests to ‘If thou art the Son of God’ in that of the passers-by, the reference being to our Lord’s confession before the high priest. Again we have an interpretative addition, the evangelist’s own reflexions being put into the mouths of the mockers. Mark’s expansion of the original tradition with regard to the mocking at the cross, of which the taunt based on the saying about the destruction of the temple is a part, is thus continued further, the practice of Matthew so providing confirmation of our conclusion with regard to Mark that he did not hesitate to make interpretative additions to sayings or narrative when he thought it desirable, the accusation against Stephen suggesting the use in this way of the saying recorded in John, ‘Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,’ as the basis of false witness before the high priest, and

in consequence as a taunt at the cross. The origin of this element in Mark's description of what he tells us took place in the high priest's palace is thus adequately explained.

Mark continues : ' And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing ? What is it which these witness against thee ? But he held his peace, and answered nothing.' If the account of the false witnesses is an interpretative addition, it is not probable that the saying of the high priest is entirely authentic. Luke records nothing of the sort. In another context in Mark we find a similar passage : ' And the chief priests accused him of many things. And Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou nothing ? behold how many things they accuse thee of. But Jesus no more answered anything ; insomuch that Pilate marvelled ' (xv. 3-5). Again Luke gives no parallel. There is however a similar passage in Luke's description of the trial before Herod. ' And he questioned him in many words ; but he answered him nothing. And the chief priests and the scribes stood, vehemently accusing him ' (xxiii. 9-10). We see a reason why Jesus did not answer questions asked simply to satisfy Herod's curiosity, for we are told, ' When Herod saw

Jesus, he was exceeding glad : for he was of a long time desirous to see him, because he had heard concerning him ; and he hoped to see some miracle done by him' (xxiii. 8). It is not so easy to see why He should not answer Pilate when asking about the accusations of the chief priests, particularly as we are told He answered the questions of the same 'chief priests and scribes' in the Jewish assembly according to Luke (xxii. 66-70), or the similar question of the high priest according to Mark (xiv. 61-62). Indeed we are distinctly told that Jesus did answer Pilate concerning an accusation made by the chief priests and scribes. Mark says : ' And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews ? And he answering saith unto him, Thou sayest ' (xv. 2). In Mark this verse stands, as it were, in the air, for we are not told why Pilate put the question, though it could hardly have been put apart from an accusation of the chief priests and scribes. In Luke we are told plainly that this was the case, so that Pilate's question follows quite naturally. ' And the whole company of them rose up, and brought him before Pilate. And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying

that he himself is Christ a king. And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews ? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest ' (xxiii. 1-3). A comparison of the narratives of Mark and Luke makes it quite plain that the statement, ' And the chief priests accused him of many things,' corresponds to ' And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king.' This being so, we see that Jesus did answer Pilate when asked about the accusations of the chief priests and scribes. The passage which follows, which says that He answered nothing, must be out of place, and in that case we must conclude that Mark has interpolated it in the trial before Pilate, though it belongs properly to the trial before Herod. The words ' And the chief priests accused him of many things ' in Mark are therefore a conflation and modification of the corresponding passage and what we are told of Herod and the priests and scribes in Luke, ' And he questioned him in many words. . . . And the chief priests and the scribes stood, vehemently accusing him.' The fourth gospel tells us that at a later point Jesus refused to answer a certain question

of Pilate prompted by an accusation of the Jews (xix. 9), and this may have helped to suggest the incident in Mark, though otherwise there are no signs of literary dependence, nor, as the circumstances are so different, can the two narratives be regarded as different traditions of the same event. ‘The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. When Pilate therefore heard this saying, he was the more afraid ; and he entered into the palace again, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou ? But Jesus gave him no answer. Pilate therefore saith unto him, Speakest thou not unto me ? knowest thou not that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee ? Jesus answered him, Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above’ (xix. 7–11).

The earlier part of the narrative in John, though it says nothing about the trial before Herod, is easily harmonised with what we find in Luke, derived apparently from Peter, but it is quite impossible to fit in the statement that after Pilate had put the question, ‘Art thou the king of the Jews ?’ the chief priests continued to accuse Him of many things. We read : ‘They lead Jesus there-

fore from Caiaphas into the palace : and it was early ; and they themselves entered not into the palace, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover. Pilate therefore went out unto them, and saith, What accusation bring ye against this man ? They answered and said unto him, If this man were not an evil doer, we should not have delivered him up unto thee. Pilate therefore said unto them, Take him yourselves, and judge him according to your law. The Jews said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death : that the word of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying by what manner of death he should die. Pilate therefore entered again into the palace, and called Jesus, and said unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews ? Jesus answered, Sayest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee concerning me ? Pilate answered, Am I a Jew ? Thine own nation and the chief priests delivered thee unto me : what hast thou done ? Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world : if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews : but now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then ? Jesus answered, Thou

sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. Pilate saith unto him, What is truth ? And when he had said this, he went out again unto the Jews ' (xviii. 28-38).

Pilate's question, we note, is exactly the same in John as in Luke and Mark. The accusation of the chief priests and scribes must have been that He claimed to be a king, though only Luke tells us this. If, as John says, the Jews would not enter into the palace for fear of defilement, the initial accusation was the only one possible. Mark's narrative clearly supposes them present in the judgment hall, for only thus would the further accusations be possible, or Pilate's remarks which followed. Before Herod however such continuous accusation, reported in Luke, would be quite possible, for as Herod had himself come up to Jerusalem as a Jew to keep the passover there would be no risk of defilement in entering his abode. Again the evidence shews that Mark's narrative is secondary and that he has transferred the incident from Herod's trial to Pilate's. If all but Peter and the other disciple fled at our

Lord's arrest, only two of His followers could give reports of the trials, and these we have in the accounts which we have seen reason to suppose those of Peter and John in the third and fourth gospels. The fuller description of the incident in Mark compared with what we find in Luke is to be ascribed to editorial expansion, partly to fit the passage into the new context, and partly to suit the evangelist's style. The only real addition is 'insomuch that Pilate marvelled.' Mark uses the word 'marvel' only four times (v. 20, vi. 6, xv. 5, 44). In one case (vi. 6) there is no real parallel in Luke where we find a different tradition, but in two cases the word appears in a comment added by Mark to the narrative which is found in Luke, after the healing of the Gerasene demoniac, 'And all men did marvel' (v. 20; cf. Luke viii. 39), and after our Lord's death, 'And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead' (xv. 44; cf. Luke xxiii. 52). We conclude therefore that the similar addition in the present context is a comment of the evangelist.

Matthew reproduces Mark's account with little more than verbal alterations: 'And when he was accused by the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. Then saith Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many

things they witness against thee ? And he gave him no answer, not even to one word : insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly' (xxvii. 12-14). Pilate's question ' Answerest thou nothing ? ' which is evidently an editorial addition in Mark, not being found in Luke, has been changed into a mere statement of fact, ' he answered nothing,' as in Luke's account of the trial before Herod. Matthew's treatment of Mark enables us the better to understand Mark's treatment of Luke, and to realise the unimportance of such editorial alterations. We find a change in exactly the opposite direction in Matthew's account of the priests' plot against Jesus, a mere statement of time becoming a saying of our Lord. In Mark, following Luke (xxii. 1), we read, ' Now after two days was the feast of the passover and the unleavened bread ' (xiv. 1), but in Matthew, ' And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these words, he said unto his disciples, Ye know that after two days the passover cometh, and the Son of man is delivered up to be crucified ' (xxvi. 1-2). Matthew thus provides an explanation of Mark's similar addition of a question, ' Answerest thou nothing ? ' where Luke has only the statement that ' he answered him nothing.'

We are now in a position to return to Mark's account of the silence of Jesus before the council. We notice that it is exactly parallel to the account of His silence before Pilate. In the former case Mark says : ' For many bare false witness against him. . . . And the high priest . . . asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing ? what is it which these witness against thee ? But he held his peace, and answered nothing.' In the latter case he says : ' And the chief priests accused him of many things. And Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou nothing ? behold how many things they accuse thee of. But Jesus no more answered anything.' As Luke has nothing to correspond to either passage in the parallel context, and as the introduction to the first saying, the account of the false witnesses, is, we have decided, an addition of the evangelist's, and the second passage likewise, the first passage must also be ascribed to the editor's hand.

One of the reasons for the addition in the evangelist's mind doubtless was the law of the Talmud which allowed the accused person to defend himself. ' The second witness was also brought in and examined. If their testimony is found to agree, they open the case for the defence. . . . If the accused say

that he has something to plead in his own defence, he is listened to.'¹ Throughout the whole of the narrative which he has added to the earlier form of the tradition preserved in Luke the evangelist is evidently trying to describe what he conceived to be the procedure at a meeting of the council.

The statement 'And the high priest stood up in the midst' seems also to have been suggested by the Talmud. The passage already quoted has a bearing on the matter, 'Men must stand when they pronounce sentence, or bear witness,' but also the following, 'The Sanhedrin was arranged in the form of a semicircle, so that they might all see each other. The Prince sat in the middle with the elders on his right and left.'² Matthew omits 'in the midst,' the reminiscences of the Talmud in Mark being as a rule obscured or omitted in the first gospel.

Mark proceeds with a passage taken from the tradition found in Luke. 'Again the high priest asked him, and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.' The introductory formula 'Again the high priest

¹ *Sanh.*, M. v. 4.

² *Ibid.* T. viii. 1.

asked him and saith unto him' is a repetition of that used before the question 'Answerest thou nothing?' 'And the high priest . . . asked Jesus, saying,' one word only appearing in Luke, 'saying,' and this referring to the chief priests and scribes, not to the high priest alone. The change is part of Mark's plan in compiling the description of the scene before the council, and is therefore editorial. The repeated questioning is doubtless intended to be, technically, the opening of the defence prescribed in the Talmud. 'If the evidence of the witnesses is found to agree, the chief judge opens the case for the defendant, and his fellow judges support him.'¹ Mark conflates two quite distinct questions in Luke, 'If thou art the Christ, tell us. . . . Art thou then the Son of God?' and gives 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' In Luke between the two questions Jesus makes the statement, 'From henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God,' so that there is a gradual development of idea, 'Christ,' 'Son of man,' 'Son of God,' but in Mark this is lost. In Luke Jesus identifies the 'Christ' of the psalter (ii. 2) with the 'son of man' of Daniel (vii. 13), as in the book of Enoch

¹ *Sanh.*, T. ix. 1c.

(xlviii. 2, 10), and ‘the throne of his glory’ of the book of Enoch (xlv. 3, lv. 4, lxi. 8, lxii. 2, 3, 5, lxix. 27, 29) with ‘the right hand of the Lord’ which ‘sheweth power’ of the psalter (cix. (cx.) 1, cxvii. (cxviii.) 15–16). The chief priests and scribes are quick to recognise the allusions, and consequently His claim to divine sonship, in the psalter ‘Thou art my son’ (ii. 7), in Enoch ‘I and my son’ (cv. 2), so that immediately they put the question, ‘Art thou then the Son of God?’ In Mark the whole sequence of thought is gone. The allusion to Psalm cxvii. (cxviii.) is lost through the omission of the words ‘of God,’ and ‘power’ becomes almost a synonym for God, as commonly in Jewish literature.¹ The allusion to Daniel vii. has become practically a quotation, ‘Ye shall see the Son of man . . . coming with the clouds of heaven,’ ‘I beheld . . . and lo one like a son of man came on the clouds of heaven’ (vii. 13). The saying is thus modified in the light of current Jewish ideas, reverential and apocalyptic. Further Judaising is seen in the title ‘the Blessed,’ which replaces the reference to God in Luke. It is found in the Talmud² and the book of Enoch (lxxvii. 1),

¹ Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, pp. 200–2.

² *Berakoth*, M. vii. 3.

but in the present passage it was perhaps suggested by the common Jewish formula 'Blessed be he,' which appears several times in the chapters of the Talmud dealing with capital charges, 'the King of kings of kings, blessed be He.'¹

Luke says our Lord's answer to the question of the council was, 'Ye say that I am.' In John we are told He gave a similar answer to Pilate, 'Thou sayest that I am a king' (xviii. 37). Mark gives 'I am' as the answer to the high priest, and Matthew 'Thou hast said' (xxvi. 64), Luke (xxiii. 3), Mark (xv. 2), and Matthew (xxvii. 11) agreeing to give 'Thou sayest' as the answer to Pilate. Matthew also gives 'Thou hast said' as our Lord's answer to Judas (xxvi. 25), in what seems to be an editorial addition. The fact that Luke's form of answer is confirmed by the occurrence of a similar form in John, corroborated in a measure in this second passage by Luke, Mark, and Matthew, leaves but little room for doubt that Luke is correct. The forms in Mark and Matthew could easily be derived from that in Luke, but the opposite is impossible. A clear affirmative, 'I am,' would hardly be modified into a statement the exact significance of which is

¹ *Sanh.*, M. iv. 5b bis, T. viii. 9.

not quite certain, and this so thoroughly that the original survives in only one passage in Mark and in none of the parallels. Our conclusion must be that the narrative in Mark is of a secondary order. In Matthew we find practically a reproduction of Mark, but on five points we notice agreement of Luke and Matthew against Mark, ‘tell us,’ ‘whether,’ ‘Son of God,’ ‘Thou hast said’ (‘Ye say’), ‘henceforth,’ besides agreement in the order of words. ‘I adjure thee by the living God’ is the only important addition to what we find in Mark or Luke. It appears to be a variant of ‘as the Lord liveth,’ a very frequent formula in an oath in the Old Testament. ‘The living God’ with the double article appears only once in the Septuagint (Ps. xli. (xlii.) 2), but with no article very often. In the New Testament it is found with the double article only in Matthew xvi. 16 apart from the present passage, though common in the epistles without an article. In both passages in the gospel it is plainly an editorial addition. The adjuration would of course be quite out of place in the account given in Luke, for there the question, ‘Art thou then the Son of God?’ follows naturally upon our Lord’s saying about the Son of man, and is in no

way an attempt to prevail upon Him to break His silence, which indeed, as we have seen, is no part of the original tradition with regard to the proceedings before the council.

Luke continues : ‘ And they said, What further need have we of witness ? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth.’ In Mark the statement is expanded. ‘ And the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What further need have we of witnesses ? Ye have heard the blasphemy : what think ye ? And they all condemned him to be worthy of death.’ We have already noticed the change from ‘ witness ’ to ‘ witnesses,’ the alteration providing the basis of Mark’s description of the search for witnesses in the high priest’s palace. The words ‘ from his own mouth ’ in Luke are evidently a reference to the law of Deuteronomy, ‘ At the mouth of two witnesses, and at the mouth of three witnesses shall every word be established ’ (xix. 15). In Luke the thought of witnesses is implicit only, and these words suggest the idea of their giving evidence. In Mark the witnesses being mentioned explicitly they are omitted, and instead we have a statement of the charge, ‘ Ye have heard the blasphemy,’ which is only implicit in Luke. Mark’s statement, ‘ And the high priest rent his

clothes,' not given in Luke, is therefore an explanatory addition derived from the Talmud which prescribes the action on proof of blasphemy. 'The blasphemer is not guilty until he have expressly uttered the Name. . . . All are sent out of the room except the chief witness, and it is said to him: Say expressly what you heard. He does so, whereupon the judges stand up and rend their clothes; and they may not mend them again.'¹ The idea apparently is that the action of the high priest was an invitation to the rest of the council to follow his example and recognise our Lord's words as blasphemy. In Matthew the accusation is made still more emphatic, 'He hath spoken blasphemy' (xxvi. 65). We note the change of person in Mark, 'Ye have heard' instead of 'We ourselves have heard' in Luke, the intention being to lead on to the additional words, 'What think ye? And they all condemned him to be worthy of death.' Again we have an addition suggested by the practice of the sanhedrin. In the midrash ascribed to R. Tanchuma we are given the question of the president and the reply of the members of the council. 'What think ye, gentlemen? And they answered, if for life, For life, and

¹ *Sanh.*, M. vii. 5.

if for death, For death.'¹ Mark's words are practically a reproduction of this. In Matthew we find that Mark's statement has been put on the lips of the members of the council, 'They answered and said, He is worthy of death' (xxvi. 66), a type of alteration we have noticed in Mark as well as in Matthew.²

Luke places the mocking of Jesus immediately after His arrival in the high priest's house, and before any examination. 'And the men that held Jesus mocked him, and beat him. And they blindfolded him, and asked him, saying, Prophesy : who is he that struck thee ? And many other things spake they against him, reviling him.' Mark places it after He had been condemned to be worthy of death. 'And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy : and the officers received him with blows of rods.' We notice the additions to the account given in Luke, suggested apparently by a passage in the second Isaiah : 'I gave my back to scourges, and my cheeks to blows of rods ; and I turned not away my face from the shame of spitting' (l. 6). The mention of spitting, His face, and the blows of rods are therefore

¹ *Tanchuma Piqqudey* (ed. Warshaw), i. fol. 132b. See Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii. p. 561.

² See p. 210 ; cf. pp. 30, 153, 297.

interpretative additions on the basis of prophecy. The curious statement that the officers 'received' Him with blows of their rods is thus explained as complementary to 'gave'—'I gave . . . my cheeks to blows of rods,' 'the officers received him with blows of rods.' The statement of the prophet, 'I gave . . . my cheeks to blows of rods,' is combined with a statement in John with regard to the proceedings before the high priest, 'One of the officers standing by gave Jesus a blow of a rod' (xviii. 22). The reference to the officers is thus explained. Though the statement that they covered Jesus' face is given in Mark, the question, 'Who is he that struck thee?' is omitted, so that the taunt 'Prophesy' is meaningless. Matthew gives a conflation of Luke and Mark, 'Then did they spit in his face and buffet him: and some smote him with blows of rods, saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ: who is he that struck thee?' (xxvi. 67–68). The reference to 'the officers' from John has disappeared, and likewise the noun for 'blows of rods,' taken from the Septuagint, though the kindred verb is used. The statement that they 'covered' His face is also omitted, the question, 'Who is he that struck thee?' added to Mark's account from Luke being

thus deprived of meaning. The text of both Mark and Matthew is thus somewhat unintelligible apart from Luke, but it is easily understood when the patchwork nature of the narratives of the first two gospels is realised. The change to 'Then did they spit in his face' in Matthew with the omission of a reference to the blindfolding is perhaps due to the influence of the Septuagint, 'I turned not away my face from the shame of spitting.' The reason for the statement that the officers 'received' Him, which we found in the prophecy, was presumably not realised, and the word was dropped, and the verb 'smite with blows of rods,' as we have seen, substituted for the noun 'blows of rods' after 'received.' 'Thou Christ' is an addition suggested by the question of the high priest, 'Whether thou be the Christ.'

Mark, having transferred the examination of the chief priests and scribes from the morning, as reported in Luke, to the previous night, retains only the setting of the enquiry in his account of the events of the next day. Luke says: 'And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council [sanhedrin]. . . . And the whole

company of them rose up, and brought him before Pilate' (xxii. 66, xxiii. 1). Mark says : ' And straightway in the morning the chief priests with the elders and scribes, and the whole council [sanhedrin], held a consultation, and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him up to Pilate ' (xv. 1). We have therefore in the second gospel a doublet of the first part of Luke's account, the first introducing the description of the examination before the chief priests and scribes as in Luke. ' And there come together all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes. . . . Now the chief priests and the whole council sought witness against Jesus to put him to death ' (xiv. 53, 55). As he has transferred the details of the meeting of the council, which according to Luke took place in the day-time, to a preliminary meeting in the night, it might have been supposed that he would omit altogether any mention of what has become a second meeting, particularly as he is able to do no more than repeat what he has said already, omitting the details. Apparently it was due to an effort to fit the proceedings to the requirements of the Talmud. We read : ' In non-capital cases the trial may take place in day-time and the verdict be given in the night ; but in capital

cases the trial takes place in day-time and the verdict is given in day-time. In non-capital cases a verdict of acquittal or of conviction may be reached the same day ; while in capital cases a verdict of acquittal may be reached the same day, but a verdict of conviction not until the following day. Therefore such a case is not tried on the eve of a Sabbath or festival.¹ ‘If the accused is found innocent he is set free ; if not, his case is passed over till the morrow. The judges then go about in pairs and . . . spend the night discussing the case and come to the court early on the morrow.’²

According to John the Jews said to Pilate ‘It is not lawful for us to put any man to death’ (xviii. 31), and all the evidence is in favour of the accuracy of this statement. No trial therefore before the sanhedrin was, strictly speaking, a capital case. Yet as the ultimate object was to put Jesus to death His trial could hardly be regarded as a non-capital case. As a quasi-capital case the evangelist seems to have considered two meetings essential, but as it was not strictly a capital case he evidently thought one of them, as in non-capital cases, might be held in the night. Possibly, indeed, it was the

¹ *Sanh.*, M. iv. 1.

² *Ibid.* M. v. 5a.

actual practice in such cases, and is not merely the evangelist's solution of a difficulty. We note that Luke's 'as soon as it was day' agrees with the rule that a trial must take place 'in day-time,' while Mark's 'straight-way in the morning' agrees with the requirement that after adjournment a trial must be continued 'early on the morrow.' We notice that in Luke the members of the council are 'the assembly of the elders,' and their meeting the 'sanhedrin,' while in Mark the members of the court are called the 'sanhedrin,' and their meeting a 'consultation.' In the Talmud, as in Luke, the members assembled are the sanhedrin. In Luke 'the assembly of the elders' consists of the 'chief priests and scribes,' but in Mark 'the elders' are distinguished from the chief priests and scribes. Again it is Luke who agrees with the Talmud, 'The Prince sat in the middle with the elders on his right and left,'¹ all the members of the court being 'elders.' 'The whole council' in each of the members of Mark's doublet appears to be a conflation of 'their council' and 'the whole [all the] company' in Luke.

Yet the narrative of Mark at the point is not completely explained as a compilation

¹ *Sanh.*, T. viii. 1.

from Luke and the Talmud. He has also utilised elements from the tradition of John, as elsewhere. We read : 'So the band and the chief captain, and the officers of the Jews, seized Jesus and bound him, and led him to Annas first ; for he was father in law to Caiaphas, which was high priest that year. . . . Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest. . . . They lead Jesus therefore from Caiaphas into the palace : and it was early' (xviii. 12-13, 24, 28). Mark very frequently assimilates similar statements, so that we are not surprised that the binding of Jesus which according to John took place before they led Him to Annas, being mentioned also when Annas sent Him to Caiaphas, in Mark is said to have taken place before He was led away to Pilate. It is regarded as a consequence of His condemnation, the beginning of the death penalty. We compare, ' And he commanded the most mighty men of those that were in his army to bind Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, and to cast them into the burning fiery furnace. Then those men were bound in their garments, having their shoes on and their turbans on their heads, and were cast into the burning fiery furnace' (Dan. iii. 20-21). Binding in the Septuagint is a sign of

conviction, and is so used very frequently. In the Talmud we read : 'When the trial is finished, the man convicted is brought out to be stoned.'¹ The death penalty being forbidden to the Jews, Mark describes the equivalent, 'They bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him up to Pilate.' Delivering to the Roman governor was the utmost the sanhedrin could do on a capital charge, as is plain in John, where the word is used several times in this connexion : ' If this man were not an evil doer, we should not have delivered him up unto thee ' (xviii. 30), ' Thine own nation and the chief priests delivered thee unto me : what hast thou done ? ' (xviii. 35), ' He that delivered me unto thee hath greater sin ' (xix. 11). In Luke in another context we read of those who tried to take hold of Jesus' speech, ' so as to deliver him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor ' (xx. 20), but the usage is not quite identical, and the word does not occur in the parallel passage of the actual delivery to Pilate, so that again apparently Mark is utilising the phraseology of John. Luke gives a more general statement to the same effect in a prediction of Jesus Himself. ' He shall be delivered up

¹ *Sanh.*, M. vi. 1.

unto the Gentiles' (xviii. 32). Mark expands this in the light of the passage under discussion. 'The Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles' (x. 33). The delivering up is here, too, the utmost the chief priests and scribes can do towards the carrying out of the death penalty. John says that when Jesus was brought to Pilate 'it was morning [early].' Mark uses the same adverb when he says it was 'in the morning.' In Matthew, 'when morning was come' (xxvii. 1), we have the noun instead. Again we have the influence of Johannine phraseology upon the second gospel.

In Matthew Mark's narrative is further developed, but there are also points in which there is a return to Luke. 'Now when morning was come, all the chief priests and the elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death: and they bound him, and led him away, and delivered him up to Pilate the governor' (xxvii. 1-2). 'All the chief priests and the elders' agrees with Luke's 'all the [the whole] company' against Mark's 'the whole council.' Matthew follows Luke in speaking of the elders 'of the people,' Mark having nothing to correspond. Matthew

says they 'led him away' and Luke they 'led him' to Pilate, but Mark says they 'carried him away.' Matthew's statement that they 'took counsel against Jesus to put him to death,' which takes the place of Mark's statement that they 'held a consultation,' is practically a reproduction of what he had said earlier that the chief priests and the whole council 'sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death' (xxvi. 59), which is based on Mark's saying that they 'sought witness against Jesus to put him to death' (xiv. 55). Matthew speaks of Pilate as 'the governor' no fewer than seven times (xxvii. 2, 11, 14, 15, 21, 27, xxviii. 14), Luke only once (xx. 20), and Mark not at all. In Matthew the Petrine tradition has undergone much further development than in Mark, by assimilation and interpretative addition much more frequently than as the result of fresh information.

Our examination of Mark's description of the search for witnesses and the night trial of Jesus in the high priest's palace seems to have proved beyond doubt that it is a compilation of material taken from the traditions of Peter and John and the rabbis. Though the sayings of the rabbis were not committed to writing until a much later period, the fact

that Mark's additions to Luke so frequently agree with what is prescribed in the Mishnah or Tosefta, or in other collections of rabbinic teaching, is in itself evidence that the traditions ultimately incorporated in the Talmud and kindred literature were already in existence in our Lord's time.

CHAPTER XI

THE DENIALS OF PETER

PERHAPS the most extraordinary example of Mark's method of compiling his narrative is to be found in his account of Peter's denials. We read : ‘ And as Peter was beneath in the court, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest ; and seeing Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and saith, Thou also wast with the Nazarene, even Jesus. But he denied, saying, I neither know, nor understand what thou sayest : and he went out into the porch ; and the cock crew. And the maid saw him, and began again to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. But he again denied it. And after a little while again they that stood by said to Peter, Of a truth thou art one of them ; for thou art a Galilæan. But he began to curse, and to swear, I know not this man of whom ye speak. And straightway the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word, how that Jesus said unto

him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept' (xiv. 66-72).

Only two disciples would be able to give a first-hand account of what took place in the courtyard of the high priest's palace, the two who followed after Jesus, Simon Peter and 'the other disciple,' as we are told in the fourth gospel. Internal evidence seems to make it plain that these two accounts are to be found in the third and fourth gospels, in which different but not contradictory stories are to be found. In Luke we read : 'And a certain maid seeing him as he sat in the light of the fire, and looking stedfastly upon him, said, This man also was with him. But he denied, saying, Woman, I know him not. And after a little while another saw him, and said, Thou also art one of them. But Peter said, Man, I am not. And after the space of about one hour another confidently affirmed, saying, Of a truth this man also was with him : for he is a Galilæan. But Peter said, Man, I know not what thou sayest. And immediately, while he yet spake, the cock crew. And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said unto him, Before the cock crow this day, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he

went out, and wept bitterly' (xxii. 56–62). In John we read : 'The maid therefore that kept the door saith unto Peter, Art thou also one of this man's disciples ? He saith, I am not. Now the servants and the officers were standing there, having made a fire of coals ; for it was cold ; and they were warming themselves : and Peter also was with them, standing and warming himself. . . . Now Peter was standing and warming himself. They said therefore unto him, Art thou also one of his disciples ? He denied, and said, I am not. One of the servants of the high priest, being a kinsman of him whose ear Peter cut off, saith, Did not I see thee in the garden with him ? Peter therefore denied again : and straightway the cock crew ' (xviii. 17–18, 25–27).

It is plain if we compare the narratives of Mark and Luke that Mark has drawn upon the Petrine tradition in large measure for his description. We note in the account of the first denial, 'One of the maids,' 'a certain maid' ; 'seeing Peter,' 'seeing him' ; 'she looked upon him, and saith,' 'and looking stedfastly upon him, said' ; 'Thou also wast with the Nazarene,' 'This man also was with him' ; 'but he denied, saying,' 'but he denied, saying' ; 'I neither know,'

‘I know him not.’ In the account of the second denial we notice, ‘And . . . saw him, and began again to say,’ ‘And . . . saw him, and said’; ‘This is one of them,’ ‘Thou also art one of them.’ In the account of the third denial we notice, ‘truly,’ ‘of a truth’; ‘for thou art a Galilæan,’ ‘for he is a Galilæan’; ‘I know not this man,’ ‘Man, I know not’; ‘And straightway . . . the cock crew,’ ‘And immediately . . . the cock crew.’

On a few points in Mark we find agreement with John. In the account of the first denial we notice ‘one of the maids,’ ‘the maid’; ‘Peter warming himself,’ ‘Peter also was . . . warming himself.’ In the account of the second denial we notice, ‘one of them,’ ‘one of his disciples’; ‘he again denied it,’ ‘he denied.’ In the account of the third denial we notice, ‘And straightway . . . the cock crew,’ ‘And straightway the cock crew.’ The points of agreement between Mark and John apart from Luke are not very remarkable, the most noticeable, ‘Peter warming himself,’ ‘Peter also was . . . warming himself,’ appearing in John in the context rather than in the actual report of the first denial.

A very extraordinary thing in the narratives of the denials is that in Mark there is

also agreement with Luke and John, when the accounts of the particular denials in these are taken in the order, three, one, two. ‘One of the maids of the high priest’ in the first story of Mark agrees with ‘one of the servants of the high priest’ in the third story of John. ‘Thou also wast with . . . Jesus’ of the first story of Mark agrees with ‘this man also was with him’ of the third story of Luke. ‘Thou also wast with the Nazarene, even Jesus’ agrees also with ‘Did not I see thee in the garden with him?’ of the third story of John, particularly when we remember that according to John ‘Jesus of Nazareth’ was twice used in the garden by those who came to arrest Jesus (xviii. 5, 7), the phrase ‘with the Nazarene’ being perhaps suggested by ‘he is a Galilæan’ of Luke’s third account, Matthew indeed substituting ‘Galilæan’ for ‘Nazarene.’ ‘I neither know . . . what thou sayest’ of Mark’s first story agrees with ‘I know not what thou sayest’ of Luke’s third story. ‘And he went out’ of Mark’s first story agrees with ‘And he went out’ of Luke’s third story. ‘And the cock crew’ of Mark’s first story agrees with ‘And . . . the cock crew’ of Luke’s third story. In Mark’s second story ‘And the maid seeing him’ agrees

with 'And a certain maid seeing him' in Luke's first story, 'this man' and 'But he denied again' with 'this man' and 'But he denied' in the same stories. 'One of them' in Mark's second account agrees with 'one of the disciples' in John's first account. 'And after a little while' in Mark's third account agrees with 'And after a little while' in Luke's second account. 'They . . . said to Peter' in Mark's third account agrees with 'They said . . . unto him' of John's second account. 'Thou art one of them' of Mark's third account agrees with 'Thou also art one of them' of Luke's second account, and with 'Art thou also one of his disciples?' in John's second account.

It seems plain that the phraseology of Mark's account of the three denials agrees with what we find in Luke and John not only when the denials are taken in the natural order, one, two, three, but also with what appears in Luke and John when taken in the order, three, one, two, and that the points of agreement are just as striking and important in the latter case as in the former. As there is agreement with both Luke and John taken in the order, three, one, two, it is probable that the evangelist utilised neither of these in this order but an account having

affinity with both. Such a narrative we have seen reason to believe used by Mark at various points of his story, and to be traceable to James.

Our investigation has shewn then that Mark has utilised for his account of the denials the Petrine tradition preserved in Luke, but not apparently the Johannine tradition, save perhaps in a very minor degree, taking the denials in the natural order, one, two, three. This tradition he has combined with another tradition, presumably the Jacobean, taking the stories of the denials in this in the order, three, one, two. That James was not an eyewitness of Peter's denials is not sufficient to prove that an account of them did not appear in the tradition traceable to him, particularly as we have found no addition to knowledge in the details which seem to be derived from this tradition, but only phraseology and statements to be found in the Petrine and Johannine traditions of the third and fourth gospels in connexion with different denials. The only piece of new information in Mark is that before his third denial Peter 'began to curse, and to swear,' and this may quite reasonably be a genuine reminiscence of what took place preserved by James but omitted

by both Peter and John, at any rate as their traditions have come down to us. It seems unlikely that it is merely an editorial addition, though Matthew says that the second denial was 'with an oath' (xxvi. 72), the intention being however, it would seem, to lead up to the later statement before the record of the third denial, 'Then began he to curse and to swear' (xxvi. 74).

In John the account of the first denial is given immediately after the statement that the other disciple brought in Peter into the court of the high priest. The second denial is placed after the description of the high priest's examination of Jesus. This description seems to be an interpolation in the story of the denials. The words which precede and follow it are practically identical. 'And Peter also was with them, standing and warming himself.' 'Now Simon Peter was standing and warming himself.' The second statement seems to be merely a repetition of the first, necessitated by the insertion of the incident of the examination before Annas. If both the story of the high priest and the second statement be omitted the narrative reads much more straightforwardly, and we see at once who 'they' were who put the question which provoked the second

denial. ‘Now the servants and the officers were standing there, having made a fire of coals ; for it was cold ; and they were warming themselves : and Peter also was with them, standing and warming himself. They said therefore unto him, Art thou also one of his disciples ? He denied, and said, I am not.’ There can be little doubt but that this represents an earlier form of the tradition.

The account given in Luke agrees exactly with this. The second denial took place soon after the first, ‘after a little while,’ while he still ‘sat in the light of the fire.’ The third denial took place according to Luke ‘after the space of about one hour’ after the second. The more natural place for a break in the report of the denials would be between the second and third denials, not between the first and second as in the present text of John. It seems not unlikely therefore that in the tradition derived from James this was the order, and that an account of the examination before the high priest stood between the second and third denial. If so, any equivalent of the statement that ‘one of the officers standing by struck Jesus with a blow of a rod,’ as it appears in John, would precede the story of the third denial. This agrees exactly with what we find in Mark,

where 'and the officers received him with blows of rods' appears just before an account of a denial, which, though the first in Mark, contains phraseology which properly belongs to the story of the third denial according to Luke and John. We have thus an explanation why Mark combines the account of the first denial according to the Petrine tradition, given in Luke, with that of the third denial according to the Jacobean tradition. After describing what took place before the high priest, utilising the Jacobean tradition apparently for the incident of the officers smiting Jesus with rods, derived ultimately from John, he proceeds to conflate the account of the denial which follows with the account of the first denial as described in the Petrine tradition. Then apparently he turned back in the Jacobean narrative and conflated the stories of the first and second denials as there given with the stories of the second and third denials as found in the Petrine tradition. The echoes of the Johannine tradition which appear in Mark's account of the denials in connexion with the wrong denial, like the story of the officers striking Jesus with rods, would thus, if our contention be right, be derived immediately not from the Johannine tradition, but from

the Jacobean, which, as James was not present in the high priest's palace, has utilised material from the account given by John. Possibly at other points in Mark likewise the Johannine material may be derived immediately from the Jacobean narrative which has incorporated Johannine matter.

This extraordinary combination of the stories of the denials from the Petrine tradition in the order, one, two, three, with the stories of the denials from the Jacobean tradition in the order, three, one, two, provides a quite adequate explanation of the phenomena presented by the Markan text. 'And he went out' after the first denial belongs properly to the third denial as in Luke, its presence at this stage being due to the conflation of the account of the third denial in the Jacobean tradition. We note the addition 'into the porch [forecourt]' so as to modify the earlier form of the statement, for if Peter had gone out of the court entirely further denials would have been impossible. Having said Peter 'went out' after the first denial, the evangelist avoids repeating the statement after the third, and says instead 'And when he thought thereon, he wept.' The statement, 'And the cock crew,' after

the first denial is likewise due to conflation with the Jacobean story of the third denial. A double cock-crowing is not impossible, and so in certain manuscripts our Lord's prediction of Peter's denials has been altered to read 'before the cock crow twice' (xiv. 30), likewise too in the repetition of the saying where we are told that it came into Peter's mind (xiv. 72). Some manuscripts however avoid the difficulty by omitting the words 'And the cock crew' after the first denial, though, unless they are authentic, there is no obvious reason why they should have been inserted in others, creating an unnecessary difficulty. They seem to be required to explain the change in the statement after the third denial, 'And straightway the second time the cock crew,' where at any rate the reference to two cock-crowings seems to be authentic. The original reference in our Lord's prediction was probably to a particular time of the night, the third watch, 'at cock crowing' (Mark xiii. 35), not to the actual crowing of a cock, the Septuagint similarly describing a time of night, 'The morning cock had just crowed' (3 Macc. v. 23), though doubtless it was the fact that he heard a cock crow at the particular moment which recalled our Lord's words to Peter's mind.

The knowledge that the reference to a second cock-crowing was not without parallel in contemporary literature¹ would help to make the result of the conflation seem not improbable, though indeed mention of an earlier cock-crowing robs the literal fulfilment of our Lord's prediction after the third denial of all point. A realisation of the fact that Mark's narrative is a conflation provides an adequate explanation.

In Mark the first denial is provoked by 'one of the maids' and the second by 'the maid,' the same apparently, whereas in Luke and John only the first denial is due to the speech of 'a certain maid,' or 'the maid.' The conflation of the accounts of different denials in Mark sufficiently explains his text, making it clear that only one maid was concerned in the matter, and she only with the first denial, the second reference to her being a doublet of the first. Similarly Mark's statement that the third denial was due to a saying of more than one, 'they that stood by said to Peter,' is an echo of what John tells us about the second denial, 'Now the servants and the officers were standing there . . . and Peter also was with them. . . . They said therefore unto him.' The

¹ Cf. Aristophanes, *Eccl.* 390; Juvenal, *Sat.* ix. 106.

fact of the conflation thus fully explains the discrepancy between Mark and what we find in Luke and John with regard to the third denial. The truth of the hypothesis seems to be beyond question.

Matthew on the whole reproduces Mark, but on quite a number of points he agrees with Luke against Mark : ‘was sitting,’ ‘sat,’—‘was’; ‘one maid,’ ‘a certain maid,’—‘one of the maids’ ; ‘I know not,’ ‘I know him not,’—‘I neither know’ ; ‘and saith,’ ‘and said,’—‘and began again to say’ ; ‘with Jesus,’ ‘with him,’—‘one of them’ ; ‘I know not the man,’ ‘Man, I am not,’—no parallel ; ‘thou also,’ ‘this man also,’—‘thou’ ; ‘the man,’ ‘man,’—‘this man’ ; ‘the word,’ ‘the word’ (both genitive),—‘the word’ (accusative) ; ‘And he went out, and wept bitterly,’ ‘And he went out, and wept bitterly,’—‘And when he thought thereon, he wept.’ Matthew speaks of Peter going out twice, but he omits all reference to a second cock crowing. In the maid’s saying before the first denial Matthew changes Mark’s ‘the Nazarene’ to ‘the Galilæan,’ putting it in the corresponding speech before the second denial, ‘Jesus the Nazarene,’ while instead of a statement that Peter is a ‘Galilæan’ in the saying before the third denial he says ‘thy

speech bewrayeth thee.' Contradicting Mark, Matthew says it was 'another maid' who provoked the second denial. 'Forecourt,' a descriptive addition of Mark suggested by the statement that Peter went out of the court, becomes in Matthew the 'porch.' We have already noticed the addition, 'with an oath,' to the account of the second denial in Matthew. The first evangelist evidently knew Mark and the Petrine tradition incorporated in Luke, but he makes no use at this point of the Johannine tradition, or even of the Jacobean tradition, which elsewhere he utilises so largely.

CHAPTER XII

THE MOCKING IN THE PRÆTORIUM

WE have already discussed Mark's account of the mocking of Jesus by the officers and others in the high priest's palace. He describes also a similar mocking by the soldiers in the prætorium of Pilate. ' And Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, released unto them Barabbas, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified. And the soldiers led him away within the court, which is the Prætorium ; and they call together the whole band. And they clothe him with purple, and plaiting a crown of thorns, they put it on him ; and they began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews ! And they smote his head with a reed, and did spit upon him, and bowing their knees worshipped him. And when they had mocked him, they took off from him the purple, and put on him his garments ' (xv. 15-20). Luke tells of a similar incident which took place before Herod. ' And Herod with his soldiers set

him at nought, and mocked him, and arraying him in gorgeous apparel sent him back to Pilate' (xxiii. 11). John also describes a similar scene. 'They lead Jesus therefore from Caiaphas into the prætorium. . . . Then Pilate therefore took Jesus, and scourged him. And the soldiers plaited a crown of thorns, and put it on his head, and arrayed him in a purple garment; and they came unto him, and said, Hail, King of the Jews! and they struck him with blows of rods. And Pilate went out again, and saith unto them, Behold, I bring him out to you. . . . Jesus therefore came out, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple garment' (xviii. 28, xix. 1-5).

The incident recorded in Luke should doubtless be regarded as the prelude to that given by John. If Herod sent Jesus back to Pilate arrayed in gorgeous apparel, it is not surprising that Pilate should join in and continue the play, and bring Jesus out to the people wearing what John calls a 'purple garment,' though it is much less probable he would take part in mocking initiated merely by his own soldiers, in the way John describes it. There seems to be no direct literary connexion between Luke's story and what we read in Mark. For the most

part Mark's narrative is based on that of John. Mark says that Pilate scourged Jesus, and the statement appears in John, but not in Luke. Luke records Pilate's words, 'I will therefore chastise him and release him' (xxiii. 22), but as the people insisted on crucifixion, the natural interpretation of the passage is that no chastisement took place. That scourging commonly preceded crucifixion we learn from various authorities,¹ and particularly Josephus. 'He first chastised with stripes, and then crucified,'² 'Florus ventured then . . . to have men of the equestrian order whipped, and nailed to the cross before his tribunal,'³ 'So they were first whipped, and then tormented with all sorts of tortures before they died, and were then crucified.'⁴ Mark's statement that Pilate, after making efforts to release Jesus, performed a quite unnecessary act of cruelty in scourging Him before crucifixion seems highly improbable. The statement found in both Luke and John that the scourging was intended as a compromise to make the capital sentence unnecessary is much more credible. Here as elsewhere Mark would

¹ Lucian, *Reviv.* ad init. ; Livy, *Hist.* xxxiii. 36.

² *Bell.* II. xiv. 9.

³ *Bell.* II. xiv. 9.

⁴ *Bell.* V. xi. 1.

appear to have written his narrative not simply on the basis of reports of eyewitnesses, but with the help of information derived from a knowledge of what frequently did take place on similar occasions. We notice that the verb used in Mark is not that found in John, but is really a Latin word with the same meaning, the corresponding noun however appearing in John in the account of the cleansing of the temple. ‘He made a scourge of cords’ (ii. 15). In the Testament of Benjamin it is used of flogging the naked body, ‘When they had taken off my coat they gave me to the Ishmaelites, and they gave me a loin cloth, and scourged me’ (ii. 3).

The statement that the soldiers ‘led him away within . . . the prætorium’ practically reproduces John’s earlier words ‘they lead Jesus . . . into the prætorium.’ John uses the word ‘prætorium’ four times (xviii. 28 *bis*, 33, xix. 9), but in Mark and Matthew it is found only in the present context, and in Luke not at all (cf. Acts xxiii. 35). ‘Court,’ which is not properly identical with ‘prætorium,’ is used nowhere else in the gospels of the palace of Pilate, only of that of the high priest (Luke xxii. 55; John xviii. 15; Mark xiv. 54, 66; Matt. xxvi. 3, 58, 69), though Luke speaks of the ‘court’ of the

strong man (xi. 21). The word appears in the present context it would seem because the evangelist is repeating a phrase he had used earlier of the palace of the high priest, 'within, into the court of the high priest,' 'within the court, which is the Prætorium,' movement into the court from without being intended apparently on both occasions, the trial taking place outside the prætorium according to John (xix. 13). In the former passage 'within' appears to have been suggested to Mark by the fact that in John Peter is said to have been obliged at first to stand 'without' (xviii. 16). The same contrast with what is found in John seems to be intended also in the present passage. This word 'without,' used of the prætorium, is particularly prominent and important in John in the account of the trial before Pilate. 'Pilate therefore went out without unto them' (xviii. 29), 'Pilate went out without again' (xix. 4), 'I bring him without to you' (xix. 4), 'Jesus therefore came out without' (xix. 5), 'He brought Jesus without' (xix. 13). In contrast to all this Mark is careful to state that the mocking of the soldiers took place 'within the court, which is the Prætorium.'

No previous mention of the 'band' of

soldiers is found in Mark, but we read of it twice in John in the account of the arrest, ‘ Judas then, having received the band of soldiers ’ (xviii. 3), ‘ So the band and the chief captain . . . seized Jesus ’ (xviii. 12). Again we have an echo of the Johannine tradition. ‘ Call together ’ is a Lukan word (Luke ix. 1, xv. 6, 9, xxiii. 13 ; Acts v. 21, x. 24, xxviii. 17), and apart from Luke and Acts is found only in the present passage in the New Testament. As Mark is editing the Petrine tradition of Luke, the fact that the word appears a little earlier in the narrative in Luke, ‘ Pilate called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people ’ (xxiii. 13), perhaps suggested its use here.

‘ And the soldiers . . . clothe him with purple, and plaiting a crown of thorns, they put it on him,’ reproduces John’s account with little change, ‘ And the soldiers plaited a crown of thorns, and put it on his head, and arrayed him in a purple garment.’ The Greek word for ‘ soldiers ’ occurs nowhere else in Mark, but it is frequent in John in the account of the crucifixion (xix. 2, 23 *bis*, 25, 32, 34). The expression ‘ clothe with purple,’ as used in Mark, differs verbally from John, but agrees both in verb and noun with Luke’s description of the rich man, ‘ He was clothed

with purple' (xvi. 19). 'Plaiting a crown' appears identically in Mark and John. Mark's description 'a thorny crown' is used in John on the second occasion, 'Jesus came out, wearing a thorny crown' (xix. 5). The verb 'put on,' or 'round,' is used only three times in Mark. In one place it is repeated from the Septuagint (xii. 1; Is. v. 2), in another, as we shall see, from John (xv. 36; John xix. 29), while in the present passage it is a conflation of the two verbs used in John, 'The soldiers . . . put it on his head, and arrayed him,' the prefix being derived from one and the stem from the other. 'And they began to salute him' is a natural improvement on 'And they came unto him, and said.' 'Began' is very common in the Synoptic gospels, appearing thirty-one times in Luke, twenty-seven in Mark, and thirteen in Matthew, but only once in John (xiii. 5). 'Salute' appears twice in each of the Synoptic gospels, not at all in John, five times in Acts, and many times in the epistles. Elsewhere Mark says, 'Running to him, they saluted him' (ix. 15), so that evidently the evangelist is paraphrasing John in his own words.

'Hail, King of the Jews' in Mark repeats John, save that 'king' is changed from the nominative to the vocative. 'And they

smote his head with a reed' is Mark's paraphrase of John's 'And they struck him with blows of rods.' Mark evidently understood the word rendered 'blows' literally, according to the etymology, of blows with a rod, not of blows with the hand, which is sometimes a possible translation. The passage of Isaiah which influenced the account of the mocking in the high priest's palace has also influenced the phraseology here, 'I gave my back to scourgings, and my cheeks to blows of rods; and I turned not away my face from the shame of spitting' (l. 6). John has nothing to correspond to 'and did spit upon him,' so that like the similar words 'And some began to spit on him' in the description of the mocking in the high priest's palace, the statement was apparently suggested by the prophecy, and not derived from another source than the Petrine and Johannine traditions of events from which, at any rate for the most part, Mark has compiled his narrative. So, too, 'his head' seems to have been suggested by 'my cheeks' in the prophecy. The word translated 'smote' is a Lukan word, appearing four times in the gospel (vi. 29, xii. 45, xviii. 13, xxiii. 48), and five times in Acts (xviii. 17, xxi. 32, xxiii. 2, 3 *bis*), twice in Matthew (xxiv. 49, xxvii. 30), once

in a passage parallel to one of the examples in Luke, and once in the passage parallel to the text under discussion, but only in the present context in Mark. The saying given in Luke, ‘To him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other’ (vi. 29), so similar to the prophecy of the second Isaiah, may have helped to suggest its use in the present passage, if a reason be sought. Twice Mark speaks of a ‘reed’ (xv. 19, 36), in both cases in the story of the passion, and in both cases in a paraphrase of John (xix. 2, 29).

There is no parallel to the words, ‘and bowing their knees worshipped him,’ in John, and they are apparently an interpretative addition. The context naturally suggests the phraseology. We read in the Septuagint, ‘And Moses . . . worshipped him . . . and they saluted one another’ (Exod. xviii. 7), ‘And bending their knees they worshipped . . . the king’ (1 Chron. xxix. 20), ‘And Bathsheba bowed, and worshipped the king’ (3 (1) Kings i. 16). Similar phraseology is not uncommon in the Old Testament. The reference to the mocking, ‘And the soldiers . . . when they had mocked him,’ is taken from Luke’s account of the crucifixion, ‘And the soldiers also mocked him’ (xxiii. 36), the statement being omitted in the parallel

context in Mark. The Greek word here used for ‘soldiers’ occurs only in these two places in the passion narratives of Luke and Mark. Though the story of the mocking before Herod is omitted from Mark, yet other material from the Petrine tradition preserved in Luke is conflated with John in the compilation of the account of the second gospel.

The statement that ‘they took off from him the purple, and put on him his garments’ has no parallel in Luke or John, and is evidently an editorial addition intended to lead up to the later saying, ‘And they part his garments among them, casting lots upon them, what each should take’ (xv. 24). In Luke the corresponding statement is one of a series intended to shew how the prophecies of the psalter were fulfilled. ‘And parting his garments among them, they cast lots. And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also scoffed at him. . . . And the soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, offering him vinegar’ (xxiii. 34–36). ‘All that beheld me scoffed at me. . . . They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots’ (Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 7, 18), ‘And for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink’ (Ps. lxviii. (lxix.) 21). Mark has failed to recognise that the be-

holding and scoffing are recorded as fulfilling prophecy, for he omits these echoes of Psalm xxi. (xxii.), though he gives other words reminiscent of the same verse, and a similar saying in Lamentations, ‘They wagged the head’ (Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 7), ‘All that passed by . . . wagged their head’ (Lam. ii. 15), ‘And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads. . . . In like manner also the chief priests mocking him among themselves with the scribes’ (xv. 29, 31). Though apparently Mark recognised the reference to Psalm lxviii. (lxix.) in the statement about the vinegar recorded in Luke, since he introduces the exact phraseology of the psalter, he transfers the incident to a later point and connects it with the cry of dereliction (xv. 36), giving instead, but before the actual crucifixion, the account of the offering of drugged wine, which we learn from the Talmud was provided by the ladies of Jerusalem to deaden the pain of those undergoing execution,¹ ‘And they offered him wine mingled with myrrh : but he received it not’ (xv. 23), the statement that ‘the soldiers also mocked him’ being utilised in the description of the clothing with purple and the crowning with thorns.

¹ See p. 289 below.

It seems quite plain also that Mark recognised the fulfilment of prophecy in the division of the garments, for the words ‘upon them,’ which he adds to Luke’s version of the saying, clearly presuppose ‘upon my vesture’ of the psalm. In the psalter the casting of lots upon the vesture is not an action distinct from the parting of the garments, and likewise in Luke and Mark the casting of lots is merely the method adopted for the distribution of the different articles of clothing. In John, however, a distinction is drawn between the ‘garments’ and the ‘vesture’: ‘The soldiers therefore, when they had crucified Jesus, took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part ; and also the coat : now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore one to another, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be : that the scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots. These things therefore the soldiers did ’ (xix. 23–24). The statement that the soldiers acted as they did because of the prophecy seems to shew that in some degree the story is founded upon the words of the psalm, the distinction drawn between the ‘garments’

and the ‘vesture’ being comparable with the similar distinction between the ass and the colt in Matthew’s interpretation of the prophecy of Zechariah, ‘Thy king cometh unto thee . . . riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass’ (xxi. 5; Zech. ix. 9), with the result that he tells us there were two animals and that Jesus rode upon both, ‘And they brought the ass, and the colt . . . and he sat upon them’ (xxi. 7). The Roman rule that ‘a guard consists of four men’¹ evidently lies behind the statement that the garments were divided into ‘four parts, to every soldier a part,’ and probably suggested the detail. Herod, we remember, put Peter in prison, and ‘delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to guard him’ (Acts xii. 4). The description of the ‘vesture’ as distinct from the ‘garments,’ though originating in a misinterpretation of the psalter, is developed in words very similar to those used by Josephus to describe the vestments of the high priest, and must be derived from the same source, the oral teaching of the rabbis preserved for us in the Talmud.² We read: ‘The high priest is indeed adorned with the same garments that

¹ Polybius, *Hist.* vi. 33; cf. Philo, *In Flacc.* § 18; ed. Mangey, vol. ii. p. 533.

² *Yoma*, fol. 72b; cf. *Zebachim*, fol. 88a, *Taanith*, fol. 11b.

we have described, without abating one ; only over these he puts on a vestment of a blue colour. This also is a long robe, reaching to his feet. . . . Now this vesture was not composed of two pieces, nor was it sewed together upon the shoulders and the sides, but it was one long vestment so woven as to have an aperture for the neck.¹ Mark though frequently utilising details of the Johannine tradition, as we have seen, makes no use of John's account of the distribution of the garments and seamless robe, and possibly when he wrote it had not been incorporated in the tradition.

To give a series of four points in which prophecy was fulfilled in the crucifixion of Jesus is a somewhat artificial way of writing a description of what happened, but there would seem to be no reason to doubt the authenticity of particular items. It would have been easy to make up a much more striking list if the author had been willing to draw upon his imagination. Only a desire to keep to the truth could have caused him to include among details fulfilling prophecy so obvious a statement as 'the people stood beholding,' when much more important prophecies, even in Psalm xxi. (xxii.), are left

¹ *Ant.* III. vii. 4.

unfulfilled. There seems to be no other evidence that the clothes of executed criminals were the perquisite of the executioners, apart from a much later law given by Ulpianus which forbade the practice¹; yet in view of the context there is no need to doubt the authenticity of the statement, the lot being a common and natural method of distributing property when an equal division was impossible (Num. xxvi. 55; Joel iii. 3; Obad. 11; Nahum iii. 10). The statement in Mark, ‘casting lots upon them, what each should take,’ is thus more likely to be accurate than what is described in John, quite apart from the original meaning of the verse in the psalm.

In his account of the distribution of the ‘garments’ Mark says nothing about the ‘vesture,’ and it is the same in his preliminary reference to the ‘garments,’ though in contrast with the ‘purple’ it would have been rather effective. ‘They took off from him the purple, and put on him his garments.’ In the first book of the Maccabees we notice an almost identical saying, the only difference being the interchange of the nouns, ‘They took off from Jonathan his garments, and put on him the purple’ (x. 62). We compare also a passage in the Testament of Zabulun,

¹ *Digesta Justiniani*, XLVIII. XX. 6.

'And they took off from Joseph the coat . . . and put on him the garment of a slave' (iv. 10). Again the same verbs in the same tense are used. As the present section of Mark is almost entirely patchwork, the passages are probably not independent. John's expression 'purple garment' is nowhere repeated. Luke tells us that Herod with his soldiers arrayed Jesus in 'gorgeous apparel' and sent Him back to Pilate. The idea that His own garments were taken off that the gorgeous apparel might be put on seems quite excluded. Similarly in John, when we are told that the soldiers arrayed Jesus in a purple garment, there is no suggestion that His own clothes were first taken off, nor do we read that they were put on again. Both in Mark and in John scourging precedes the vesting in purple, but not immediately in the former. To what extent scourging involved the taking off of garments is rather doubtful, and certainly, when the chief captain commanded Paul to be examined by scourging, though we are told that 'they had tied him up with the thongs' (Acts xxii. 25), nothing is said of his clothes being taken off first or put on afterwards. After the scourging Mark tells us that the soldiers led Jesus away within the

court and called together the whole band of soldiers, and then clothed Him with purple. That Jesus was deprived of His garments all the time that these things were being done seems very improbable. As the clothing with purple would not necessitate His own raiment being removed, Mark's statement that after taking off the purple they 'put on him his garments' seems to be without foundation in fact and merely an editorial addition suggested by other writings, and intended to lead up to the incident of the distribution of 'his garments' later, the same description of them being used on both occasions. In view of the composite character of this section of Mark, and the fact that the material which is authentic whether from John or Luke has been removed from its proper context, this conclusion need cause no surprise.

The account in Matthew is particularly important: 'Then released he unto them Barabbas: but Jesus he scourged and delivered to be crucified. Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the prætorium, and gathered unto him the whole band. And they clothed him, and put on him a scarlet robe. And they plaited a crown of thorns and put it upon his head,

and a reed in his right hand ; and they kneeled down before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews ! And they spat upon him, and took the reed and smote him on the head. And when they had mocked him, they took off from him the robe, and put on him his garments ' (xxvii. 26-31). We notice that the soldiers are now said to be ' the soldiers of the governor,' an interpretative addition. The statement that they ' took Jesus into the prætorium ' seems to imply that previously He was outside, and agrees with the statement of John that He was condemned without the prætorium at a place called Gabbatha. Mark's statement that they ' led him away within the court, which is the Prætorium,' perhaps means the same, though it is capable of another interpretation, that He was already within when they led Him away. The change from ' they call together ' to ' they gathered unto him ' is apparently merely interpretative. Instead of the words ' they clothed him ' some manuscripts read ' they stripped him,' the difference in the Greek being merely of one letter. Mark says, ' And they clothe him with purple, and . . . they put on him,' and, as Matthew is clearly based on Mark, it seems improbable that the reading in Matthew should be other

than ‘And they clothed him, and put on him a scarlet robe.’ The Greek word for ‘clothe’ in Mark is a reduplicated form of that used, in the manuscripts which read ‘clothe,’ in Matthew. It is found only six times in the Septuagint (2 Kings (Sam.) i. 24, xiii. 18; Prov. xxix. 39 (xxxi. 21); Judith ix. 1, x. 3; Eccl. l. 11), and in three of the passages there is a variant reading, but in each case it seems to be used with a meaning somewhat more formal than merely ‘clothe,’ which properly translates the simpler form of the verb. Perhaps we should translate ‘And they robe him in purple.’ Some such meaning is implied also in the only other passage where the word appears in the New Testament (Luke xvi. 19). ‘They clothed him’ in Matthew would then be merely the substitution of the simpler form of the verb, though with no real change in meaning. The statement that ‘they put on him a scarlet robe’ is an explanation of the way in which ‘they clothed him,’—‘And clothing him they put on him a scarlet robe.’ In the next sentence we notice the close agreement which exists between Matthew and John, ‘And they plaited a crown of thorns and put it upon his head,’ ‘And the soldiers plaited a crown of thorns, and put it on his head.’ Five

consecutive words in the Greek are identical, and for the rest the only differences are that Matthew has a preposition with the genitive where John has the dative, and that Matthew puts ‘his’ after ‘head’ but John before. In Mark only two words are the same as those found in John, and even these are not in the same relative position, no mention being made of the ‘head.’ That there is some kind of literary connexion seems beyond dispute, and yet it seems impossible to suppose that John is a source for the changes made by Matthew in Mark. As in the case of the introduction to the miracle of the feeding of the four thousand (Matt. xv. 29–31; Mark vii. 31–37; cf. John vi. 1–3), it would appear that Matthew at this point preserves an earlier form of the text than Mark, and one in closer agreement with that of John, though in the present passage, it would seem, Matthew and Mark are utilising Johannine material, while in the former both Matthew and Mark, representing the Jacobean tradition, and the fourth gospel, containing the Johannine, are derived apparently from an earlier source.

If this be so, neither Matthew nor the present text of Mark can be regarded as giving the original form of the Markan

narrative which would appear to have run as follows, ‘And robing him they put about him purple, and plaiting a crown of thorns they put it upon his head.’ At any rate such a parent text provides an explanation of what we find in both Matthew and Mark. In Matthew’s text there would be only two alterations, ‘clothing’ the more ordinary word instead of ‘robing,’ and ‘a scarlet robe’ instead of the vague ‘purple.’ ‘A scarlet robe’ is evidently an interpretative alteration, the garment being a soldier’s scarlet cloak such as would naturally be at hand in the prætorium. There is no need to suppose another source. In Mark the changes seem to be due to the influence of other texts. In Luke we read ‘he was robed in purple’ (xvi. 19), so that it was natural to take the word ‘purple’ with ‘robing him.’ The verb rendered ‘put about’ is used once in the Septuagint of clothing, ‘Put thy raiment about thee’ (Ruth iii. 3), but it is not really a synonym for ‘clothe,’ and most frequently it is used of different kinds of headgear—a crown (Job xxxi. 36; Ecclus. vi. 31 (32)), diadem (Esth. i. 11; 1 Macc. xi. 13, xii. 39, xiii. 32), tiara (Exod. xxix. 9; Lev. viii. 13, xvi. 4), mitre (Is. lxi. 10), helmet (Is. lix. 17; Wis. v. 18). It was natural

therefore that ‘they put about him’ should come to be taken with ‘a crown of thorns’ rather than as governing ‘purple.’ Only a slight rearrangement of the sentence was necessary to effect these two changes and link the two verbs with the nouns most commonly used with them. The rest of the sentence could then be dropped. Thus we have an explanation of the curious order of the text in Mark, in which the putting on of the crown is mentioned before the plaiting, ‘And they robe him with purple, and put on him plaiting a crown of thorns.’ When ‘crown’ was no longer governed by ‘plaiting’ it was necessary to change ‘out of thorns’ to ‘thorny,’ for though it is possible to say ‘plaiting a crown out of thorns,’ it is not possible, strictly, to say ‘they put on him a crown out of thorns,’ but rather ‘they put on him a thorny crown,’ John employing the two forms of expression in the two different cases, ‘plaiting a crown out of thorns’ (xix. 2), ‘wearing a thorny crown’ (xix. 5).

Matthew next tells us that they put ‘a reed in his right hand.’ That it is an addition to the original form of the narrative seems suggested by the fact that it does not properly fit the context, for the verb, in Matthew as in John, is really ‘put upon’

not ‘put.’ We notice the development of thought in connexion with the reed. In John we read simply of ‘blows,’ the etymology of the word suggesting ‘blows with rods.’ In Mark this has become ‘they smote his head with a reed,’ the instrument being specifically mentioned. Matthew says further that first of all they put the ‘reed in his right hand.’ There is a similar development in the references to the purple robe. In John it is a ‘purple garment’; in Mark ‘purple,’ indefinite and yet suggesting the purple of kings according to the usage of the Septuagint; in Matthew a ‘scarlet cloak,’ such as was worn by soldiers (2 Macc. xii. 35). An interesting parallel is found in Philo. ‘Spreading a strip of byblus they put it on his head for a diadem . . . and they delivered to him for a sceptre a short piece of native papyrus, which they saw thrown by the way. And because he was dressed as a king . . . they came to him, some as though to salute him, and others as though to plead a cause.’¹ The use of a reed as a sceptre agrees with Matthew, but the reference to salutation with Mark, the make-believe crown (‘put on,’ as in Mark) appearing in both, as in John. A literary connexion seems improbable,

¹ *In Flaccum*, § 6; ed. Mangey, vol. ii. p. 522.

the points of affinity being divided among the different gospels, and in view of the development of thought which we have noticed in the various accounts, impossible. The narrative shews rather the widespread popularity of such crude mockery. Perhaps the phraseology of Ezekiel, though used in a very different connexion, may not have been without influence on the gospel text, 'And in his hand was . . . a reed . . . and in the hand of the man a reed' (xl. 3, 5).

Matthew replaces 'And bowing their knees worshipped him' of Mark by 'And they kneeled down before him,' the verb 'kneeled down' appearing twice in Mark (i. 40, x. 17), and twice in Matthew (xvii. 14, xxvii. 29). The meaning is practically the same. Matthew's statement 'And mocked him' merely anticipates 'And when they had mocked him' found in both Mark and Matthew a little later, and derived from Luke's story of the crucifixion (xxiii. 36). The words 'And they took the reed' are necessitated by the statement that first of all it was put in Jesus' hand. The substitution of 'robe' for 'purple,' 'They took off from him the robe, and put on him his garments,' mars the contrast between the treatment of Jesus and Jonathan, 'And they

took off from Jonathan his garments, and put on him the purple' (1 Macc. x. 62).

That our Lord would be mocked by the Gentiles He Himself had predicted. Luke says: 'Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man. For he shall be delivered up unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and shamefully entreated, and spit upon: and they shall scourge and kill him: and the third day he shall rise again' (xviii. 31-33). The details, it is plainly stated, are derived from the prophets. The basis of the statement is to be found apparently in the description of the Servant of Jehovah: 'His soul was delivered to death . . . and he was delivered because of their iniquities' (Is. liii. 12). Other passages help to complete the picture: 'They shall be delivered to the Gentiles' (Hos. viii. 10), 'That they should not deliver him into the hands of the people to slay him' (Jer. xxxiii. (xxvi.) 24), 'I will not kill thee, neither will I deliver thee into the hands of these men' (Jer. xl. (xxxviii.) 16), 'They scoffed at his messengers, and despised his words, and mocked his prophets' (2 Chron. xxxvi. 16), 'Thou, who hatest shameful treatment . . .

appear to those . . . who are shamefully entreated by abhorred lawless Gentiles' (3 Macc. vi. 9), 'I gave my back to scourges . . . and I turned not away my face from the shame of spitting' (Is. l. 6). The prediction of the resurrection appears to be based on a prophecy of Hosea, 'On the third day we shall rise again, and shall live before him' (vi. 2 (3)).

The prediction is not precisely fulfilled in the ensuing narrative in Luke, for it says nothing of the spitting and scourging. In Mark and Matthew we read of spitting in the high priest's palace and in the prætorium of Pilate, but in both cases we decided it was an editorial addition suggested by the prophecy of Isaiah. According to Luke, Pilate said 'I will therefore chastise him, and release him,' but, as they insisted on His crucifixion, and Pilate delivered Him to their will, the suggestion is, as already noticed, that the scourging did not take place. John however records it, agreeing with Luke to the extent that he regards it as intended to take the place of crucifixion. In Mark and Matthew the scourging is a preliminary to crucifixion. It is in Mark and Matthew then, and not in Luke, that we read of a fulfilment of the prophecy

recorded in Luke, that they would spit upon Jesus, and scourge Him before crucifixion. These additions of Mark to the narrative of the passion given in Luke seem therefore to have been suggested by the prediction of Jesus and the prophecies on which it was based, and intended to record the fulfilment, the fact that they were predicted being regarded as sufficient evidence that they took place.

In Mark's version of our Lord's prediction the reference to the prophets has disappeared : 'Behold, we go up to Jerusalem ; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes ; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles : and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and shall kill him ; and after three days he shall rise again' (x. 33-34). We note the addition, 'unto the chief priests and the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him,' to which there is no parallel in Luke. We see now a reason for the omission of the reference to the prophets, for there is obviously no passage in the Old Testament which speaks of a delivery to the chief priests and scribes. The addition,

it would seem, is made in the light of what actually happened, and the saying has become a detailed prediction of the passion, not a declaration that the words of the prophets would be fulfilled. It is not very plain whether the mocking, spitting, scourging and killing are intended to refer to the chief priests and the scribes or to the Gentiles, and indeed, as we have seen, in Mark the narrative of the Petrine tradition has been modified in such a way that at any rate the first two are ascribed to both, mocking, spitting and buffeting taking place in the high priest's palace as well as the mocking, spitting and scourging which took place in the prætorium of Pilate. The change from 'the third day' to 'after three days' obscures the source of the prophecy in Hosea.

Matthew's version of the saying (xx. 18-19) is based on Mark's, but there are several alterations. The reference to spitting is omitted, though later in the gospel we are told it took place in the high priest's palace and in the prætorium. 'Kill' is changed to 'crucify,' an interpretative alteration in the light of actual events. It is quite plain in Matthew, as in Luke, that it is the Gentiles who will mock, scourge and crucify (kill).

Matthew agrees with Luke against Mark in reading ‘the third day,’ not ‘after three days,’ though the article is not repeated as in Luke and Hosea. The verb for ‘he shall be raised up’ is different from that used in Luke and Mark and the prophecy, so that the allusion to Hosea is lost.

CHAPTER XIII

THE DEATH OF JESUS

MANY other passages in the gospels might be examined with profit, but it will perhaps suffice if we conclude our investigation with a discussion of the account of our Lord's death and the events which immediately preceded or followed it. In Mark we read : ' And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour. And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani ? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? And some of them that stood by, when they heard it, said, Behold, he calleth Elijah. And one ran, and filling a sponge full of vinegar, put it on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, Let be ; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down. And Jesus uttered a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom ' (xv. 33-38). In Luke we read :

‘And it was now about the sixth hour, and a darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour, the sun’s light failing : and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst. And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit : and having said this, he gave up the ghost’ (xxiii. 44–46).

Comparison shews that Mark’s narrative adds much to Luke’s account, but even in Luke a large part seems to be an editorial addition. Much of the phraseology is taken from the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. ‘It was about the sixth hour’ (Jos. viii. 1), ‘There shall be in all the land darkness and blackness’ (Sim. viii. 4), ‘The sun being quenched’ (Levi iv. 1), ‘The veil of the temple shall be rent’ (Levi x. 3). The statement about the darkness in the Testament of Simeon is evidently based on the description of the plague of darkness in Exodus, and this has also influenced Luke’s account, ‘And there was darkness, blackness, tempest, over all the land of Egypt three days’ (x. 22). Luke largely reproduces this, ‘And there was darkness over . . . the land’ being identical in the Greek in both. ‘Whole’ likewise appears in the same connexion in the Septuagint ‘over the

whole land of Egypt' (Gen. xli. 43), 'In the whole land of Egypt' (Exod. v. 12). The 'three days' of the story in Exodus have become three hours in the gospel, 'about the sixth hour . . . until the ninth hour.' The thought which suggested the interpretative addition is expressed earlier in Luke, 'This is your hour, and the power of darkness' (xxii. 53). The spirit of darkness in the Testaments is Beliar, and so it is Beliar who is regarded as triumphing at the crucifixion according to Luke. 'When I saw the spirit of Beliar was troubling her' (vii. 4) is the description of the event which in the Testament of Joseph is said to have ended when 'it was about the sixth hour' (viii. 1). We read also 'Choose therefore for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar' (Levi xix. 1), 'And Beliar shall be in darkness with the Egyptians' (Jos. xx. 2).¹

If the statement in Luke that 'it was now about the sixth hour' is derived verbally from the Testament of Joseph, we can hardly look for any close correspondence with actual fact. Speaking of the trial before Pilate, John says 'It was about the sixth hour' (xix. 14), the Greek, however, differing from

¹ Eng. trans. Charles (S.P.C.K.).

what we find in Luke and the Testament of Joseph. In view of the many things which happened that morning, the trial before the council, two appearances before Pilate and one before Herod, besides various other incidents, John's statement seems to be much more probable than Luke's. Mark repeats the substance of what we find in Luke with regard to the time, but the close correspondence with the Testament of Joseph has gone. 'And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour' (xv. 33). Mark adds other items to the time-table of the day : 'And it was the third hour, and they crucified him' (xv. 25), 'And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani ?' (xv. 34). He also gives a time-table of the events of the last week, dividing them among the days, but it is doubtful whether in either case he has any authority other than his own imagination. Matthew does not repeat the statement that it was the third hour when they crucified him. Though originally in Luke the references to 'the sixth hour' and 'the ninth hour' must have been interpreted symbolically, in Mark they are evidently to be understood literally—for otherwise the time-table would be meaningless. In the same

way the rending of the veil of the temple, which is placed after our Lord's death, is clearly regarded as a literal fact, ' And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom ' (xv. 38). The incidents recorded between the citations from the Testaments seem to preclude any other interpretation. In Matthew likewise the literal interpretation is evidently intended, a list of other portents being added to the statement about the veil of the temple, in part at any rate, from the same source. ' And behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom ; and the earth did quake ; and the rocks were rent ; and the tombs were opened ; and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised ; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many ' (xxvii. 51-53). In the Testament of Levi we read : ' Because when the rocks are being rent, and the sun quenched . . . and the invisible spirits melting away, and Hades taking spoils through the visitations of the Most High, men will be unbelieving and persist in their iniquity '¹ (iv. 1). There is evidently a connexion between the statements of Matthew and the Testament

¹ Eng. trans. Charles (S.P.C.K.).

of Levi, though the former interprets the symbolic words of the latter literally.

Among the portents at the death of Jesus Luke mentions ‘the sun failing,’ a modification, as we have seen, of words in the Testament of Levi, ‘the sun being quenched.’ The Greek word translated ‘fail’ is Lukan, appearing three times in the gospel (xvi. 9, xxii. 32, xxiii. 45), but only once elsewhere in the New Testament (Heb. i. 12) in a quotation from the Septuagint (Ps. ci. (cii.) 27). In Mark’s narrative at first sight we seem to find nothing to correspond. Certainly the statement in Luke is difficult if understood literally, the Greek word translated ‘failing’ being commonly used of an eclipse, the noun ‘eclipse’ indeed being derived from this verb. An eclipse of the sun can only take place at new moon, but the Passover is at full moon. This meaning being impossible, the second evangelist evidently looked for another, apparently not realising that the words are really little more than a repetition of the statement about the darkness. In the Old Testament ἡλιού is one form taken by the name Elijah, so that, with breathings and accents absent, it is possible to translate τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος ‘Elijah failing.’¹ Many

¹ See Abbott in *Classical Review*, vol. vii. (Dec. 1893), pp. 443–4.

things seemed to favour such an interpretation. At the transfiguration, according to Luke, Moses and Elijah ' spake of his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem ' (ix. 31). The darkness over the whole land was such as Moses had caused in Egypt. The expectation that Elijah would intervene to help God's people in times of crisis was a commonplace of Jewish popular religion at the time, and there is considerable evidence of it in the Talmud. From noon until the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that is from the sixth hour until the ninth hour, Elijah had mocked the priests of Baal, bidding them call 'with a loud voice' (3 (1) Kings xviii. 27-29). From the sixth hour until the ninth hour, according to Luke, Jesus hung in darkness on the cross, but Elijah did not intervene. Like the prophets of Baal He too had cried 'with a loud voice,' and in vain. Had Elijah failed? It was not by any means absurd to suppose that the difficult words of the Petrine tradition of Luke were intended to mean 'Elijah failing.'

Or, it might be thought, the word should be not *ηλιού* but *ἐλωί*, which is sometimes left untranslated in the Greek of the Septuagint. 'The mountains were shaken before the face of the Lord Eloi' (Judges v. 5). So

Hannah called upon God, ‘O Adonai Lord Eloë Sabaoth’ (1 Kings (Sam.) i. 11). The words found in Luke might thus be interpreted ‘Eloi failing,’ the thought being that the cry to God, ‘Eloi,’ had been in vain. What could the cry addressing God as ‘Eloi’ have been? As we have noticed, Luke’s account of the Passion is full of reminiscences of the twenty-first (second) psalm. ‘And parting his garments among them, they cast lots,’ ‘And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also scoffed at him.’ To some extent Mark grasped this, repeating the words about the garments, and adding ‘wagging their heads,’ another reminiscence of the same psalm. The psalm spoke of God failing or forsaking his servant, ‘My God, my God . . . why hast thou forsaken me?’ (xxi. (xxii.) 1), and the words are recorded as having been used by Esther at a time of spiritual depression. We read in the Talmud: ‘Esther stood in the inner court of the palace. R. Levi saith, When she was now just come up to the idol temple, the divine glory departed from her: therefore she said, Eli, Eli, lamma azabhtani.’¹ The fact that the saying appears twice in the Talmud is evidence that

¹ Babylonian *Megillah*, fol. 15b; Gloss on *Yoma*, fol. 29a. See Lightfoot, *Works*, xi. p. 351.

it was widely known. Was this then the cry intended ?

Mark connects the offering of vinegar to our Lord with the cry of dereliction, but in Luke, where no mention is made of this word from the cross, it is one of the series of details regarded as fulfilling prophecies in the psalter. ‘ And the soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, offering him vinegar ’ (xxiii. 36). In the psalm we read : ‘ For thou knowest my reproach, and my shame, and my dishonour : all that afflict me are before thee . . . for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink ’ (lxviii. (lxix.) 19, 21). The idea that the vinegar was given in mockery is evidently derived from the prophecy, the action by no means necessarily suggesting it. In John the thought of the fulfilment of prophecy is placed in the forefront. ‘ After this Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished, that the scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst. There was set there a vessel full of vinegar : so they put a sponge full of the vinegar upon hyssop, and brought it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he saith, It is finished ’ (xix. 28–30). The appearance of the same Greek word, translated ‘ offering,’ ‘ brought,’ in the two accounts, as well as the phraseology of

Psalm lxviii. (lxix.), suggests that the narratives of Luke and John are developed from a common original. In John, however, we recognise also the influence of various other passages. The mention of hyssop reminds us of another verse of the psalter, 'Thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed' (l. (li.) 7). In the accounts of ceremonial cleansing in the Pentateuch we several times find the words 'vessel' and 'hyssop' associated as in the gospel. 'And he shall take to purify the house two clean living birds . . . and hyssop. And he shall kill one of the birds in an earthen vessel over running water. And he shall take . . . the hyssop and the living bird; and he shall dip it into the blood of the bird killed over running water, and with them shall sprinkle the house seven times' (Lev. xiv. 49–51), 'And for the unclean they shall take of the burnt ashes of purification, and they shall pour upon them running water into a vessel. And a clean man shall take hyssop and dip it into the water, and sprinkle it upon the house' (Num. xix. 17–18). In the account of the passover mention of the vessel is found only in the Hebrew, 'And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the basin, and strike the lintel and the two side

posts with the blood that is in the basin' (Exod. xii. 22). In the rules of the Talmud for the observance of the feast of the passover, at the beginning of the meal, after washing his hands, the celebrant is directed to take one of the bitter herbs and dip it in a vessel of vinegar or salt water, and to distribute to all present, the herb so dipped being explained as representing the hyssop dipped in blood with which the houses were sprinkled at the first passover.¹

It seems plain then that the details of the description of the offering of vinegar to Jesus on the cross in the fourth gospel have been influenced by the rabbinical regulations for the paschal feast, another reference to the passover in the Johannine account of the crucifixion appearing later in a quotation from the same chapter of Exodus, 'A bone of him shall not be broken' (John xix. 36), 'A bone of him ye shall not break' (Exod. xii. 46). As the offering of vinegar to Jesus is interpreted so differently in Luke and John, in the former as an act of mockery because of the prophecy in the psalter (lxviii. (lxix.) 21), and in the latter as suggesting also the regulations for the passover, there is no room for doubt that the act is historical. The same Greek word

¹ *Pesachim*, x. 1-9 *passim*.

was used of the nauseous wine which had undergone acid fermentation to which the psalmist referred (lxviii. (lxix.) 21), of the vinegar used as a relish at meals (Ruth ii. 14) in particular at the passover feast, and of the sour wine which was a common drink (Num. vi. 3), particularly of soldiers.¹ That this last was offered to Jesus on the cross as the gospels narrate is in no way improbable, and by none with greater likelihood than by the soldiers, the interpretations put upon the act in Luke and John being merely, however, the result of pious reflexion on the meaning of the incident.

Mark, as very frequently, combines the Petrine tradition preserved in Luke with the Johannine, ‘And one ran, and filling a sponge full of vinegar, put it on a reed, and gave him to drink’ (xv. 36). In describing the mocking in the prætorium, relying on the etymology, Mark has paraphrased the statement of John, ‘they struck him with blows (of rods)’ (xix. 3), with the words, ‘they smote his head with a reed’ (xv. 19); similarly he interprets ‘they put a sponge full of the vinegar upon hyssop’ as meaning ‘filling a sponge full of vinegar, he put it on a

¹ Aristophanes, *Acharnae*, 35; Plutarch, *Cato Major*, i. p. 336.

reed,' the significance of the hyssop not being understood. Yet the evangelist quite realised, apparently, that the action was a fulfilment of prophecy, for the verb translated 'gave to drink' appears in the psalm (lxviii. (lxix.) 21), but not in Luke or John.

Luke says, 'The soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, offering him vinegar,' but Mark, who, as we have seen, has transferred the statement that the soldiers mocked Jesus to his description of the events in the prætorium, makes no specific mention of mocking at this point. Still, though the word is absent, it is clear that the second evangelist agreed with the third in regarding the vinegar as offered in mockery, as the reminiscence of the psalm makes plain. We read : 'I waited . . . for one to comfort me, and I found none . . . And for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink' (lxviii. (lxix.) 20-21). The narrative is in fact based on the experience of the psalmist. The cry 'Why hast thou forsaken me?' particularly if regarded as addressed to Elijah, corresponds to the words 'I waited . . . for one to comfort me, and I found none.' To the psalmist in his disappointment they offered vinegar in mockery, and Mark says the same treatment was accorded to Jesus. 'And one

ran, and filling a sponge with vinegar, put it on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, Let be ; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down.' The parallel between the psalmist and Jesus according to Mark is exact. 'They persecuted him whom thou hast smitten : and they added to the grief of my wounds' (lxviii. (lxix.) 26). Of the two interpretations of the words in Luke properly translated 'the sun failing'—'Eloi failing,' 'Elijah failing'—Mark adopts the former as authentic, identifying the cry with the words of the psalmist used by Esther in a moment of depression according to the Talmud, and attributes the latter to the bystanders, making it the basis of their mockery in which another prophecy of the psalter received fulfilment. 'Eloi,' or 'Eloe,' the form which the word takes as transliterated in the Septuagint, suggests the Aramaic rather than the Hebrew of Psalm xxi. (xxii.) 1, and the intention of the evangelist apparently was to give the quotation in an Aramaic dress, though a completely Aramaic form is found only in certain manuscripts. In the rest, with variable spellings, we read, 'Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani,' 'lama' being the Hebrew form. In Matthew we find 'lema,' and the whole is Aramaic, the first

gospel perhaps thus giving once again an earlier version of the text. In 'Codex Bezae' in both Mark and Matthew we read 'Eli, Eli, lama zaphthani,' intended presumably to be a transliteration of the Hebrew of the psalter. The offering of the vinegar in Mark, as in Luke and the psalter, is an act of mockery, the words uttered by the man who offered it, 'Let be ; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down,' being evidently intended as an added cruelty. 'Let be,' we note, takes up the last word of the saying, 'sabachthani,' the same Aramaic word in the book of Daniel (iv. 15, 23, 26) being translated by the corresponding Greek word in the Septuagint (iv. 12, 23). In Matthew the true meaning of the taunt is lost, and it has become a rebuke of the man offering the vinegar by other bystanders. 'And the rest said, Let be ; let us see whether Elijah cometh to save him' (xxvii. 49).

Mark gives also an account of a somewhat similar incident, the offering of drugged wine to Jesus before crucifixion, inserting it in a combination of Petrine and Johannine material. In Luke we read : 'And when they came unto the place which is called The skull, there they crucified him' (xxiii. 33). In John we read : 'And he went out, bearing

the cross for himself, unto the place called The place of a skull, which is called in Hebrew Golgotha : where they crucified him' (xix. 17-18). In Mark we read : ' And they bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull. And they offered him wine mingled with myrrh : but he received it not. And they crucify him ' (xv. 22-24).

Again Mark's narrative, as the context makes clear, is based on that found in Luke, but certain elements, as the name ' Golgotha,' and ' the place of a skull,' are derived from John. The incident of the drugged wine is drawn from another source, and seems to be another example of the expansion of the story by details suggested by a knowledge of what commonly happened on similar occasions, such as we have noticed at various points in the gospel already.¹ We read in the Talmud : ' To those that were to be executed, they gave a grain of myrrh infused in wine to drink, that their understanding might be disturbed, as it is said, Give strong drink to them that are ready to die, and wine to those that are of a sorrowful heart, etc. And the tradition is, That some women of quality in Jerusalem allowed this freely of their own cost.'² Luke

¹ See pp. 196, 211-3, 218-9, 222-4, 247-8.

² Bab. *Sanh.*, fol. 43a. See Lightfoot, *Works*, xi. p. 348.

tells us that the ‘daughters of Jerusalem’ followed Jesus to the place of crucifixion, but says nothing about any provision by them of drugged wine (xxiii. 27–31). Yet this incident and the fact that in Luke the offering of vinegar is placed at the beginning of the account of the crucifixion may have suggested the insertion of such an episode into the composite narrative of Mark. In the Septuagint the passage quoted from the book of Proverbs reads : ‘ Give strong drink to those that are in sorrow, and wine to drink to those in pain ’ (xxiv. 74 (xxxii. 6)). We notice the words ‘ give . . . wine . . . to ’ reproduced in Mark, though the combination is quite uncommon. The purpose of the narcotic was to produce a degree of insensibility, but as Jesus was conscious to the last, it was necessary to limit the story to the offer of the drug, and to add ‘ but he received it not.’ In Matthew we read : ‘ They gave him wine to drink mingled with gall : and when he had tasted it, he would not drink ’ (xxvii. 34). We notice an even closer affinity with the passage in Proverbs : ‘ they gave him wine to drink,’ ‘ give . . . wine to drink to those.’ The words ‘ mingled with gall ’ shew the influence of the prophecy of the psalter which foretold also the offering of vinegar. ‘ And they gave

me gall for my food ; and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink ' (lxviii. (lxix.) 21). The one prophecy of the psalm has thus a double fulfilment in Matthew's narrative, in the offering of the drugged wine and in the offering of vinegar. The desire to see a fulfilment of prophecy in the former incident necessitated a change in Mark's statement that ' he received it not,' so that we now read, ' And when he had tasted it, he would not drink,' a complete refusal making the prophecy inapplicable. As a result, probably by inadvertence, the evangelist has added words which imply ignorance on our Lord's part, though, as a rule, he eliminates such passages from the narrative he takes over from Mark.

According to Luke, after the darkness and other portents ' Jesus cried with a loud voice,' and then commanding His spirit to the Father gave up the ghost. In Mark after the darkness we are told that ' Jesus cried with a loud voice,' and then after the incident of the offering of the vinegar that ' Jesus uttered a loud voice, and gave up the ghost.' The interpolation of the passage describing the supposed appeal to Elijah has necessitated the doubling of the reference to the loud cry in order to preserve the same connexions as

in Luke. This, as we have seen,¹ is a common result of interpolations, and sometimes helps us to recognise their existence. Matthew says, ‘Jesus cried again with a loud voice,’ attempting thus to explain the repetition.

The ‘loud voice’ in Luke would seem to be identical with what is commonly regarded as the seventh word from the cross. ‘And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.’ In the third gospel this is the last word of Jesus, ‘and having said this, he gave up the ghost.’ In John, as we have seen, we find another tradition. ‘After this Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished, that the scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst. There was set there a vessel full of vinegar: so they put a sponge full of the vinegar upon hyssop, and brought it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up his spirit’ (xix. 28–30). We have concluded that the offering of the vinegar is an historic event, and, if so, there is no reason why it should be otherwise with the cry which John tells us prompted the offer. It is very unlikely that Jesus said ‘I thirst’ in order

¹ Cf. pp. 212–3, 221–2, 237–8, 240–2.

'that the scripture might be accomplished,' if by this is meant that a particular prophecy was present to the consciousness of Jesus and moved Him to utter the word, but it is equally improbable that a fulfilment of scripture would ever have been looked for in such a saying and the offering of vinegar, if they had not both been authentic. Again, if 'I thirst' is authentic, 'It is finished' must be the same. The two words are closely connected in the mind of the evangelist, and he anticipates the second word in his introduction to the first, 'Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished, that the scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst.' Both the thought and the phraseology are found in earlier sayings of Jesus, recorded however not in John but in Luke. 'All the things that are written by the prophets shall be finished unto the Son of man' (xviii. 31). 'This which is written must be finished in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors : for that which concerneth me hath a finish' (xxii. 37). We compare also Luke's report of Paul's words at Antioch in Pisidia, 'And when they had finished all things that were written of him, they took him down from the tree' (Acts xiii. 29). In view of the earlier sayings nothing could be more suitable

as the last word of Jesus than ‘ It is finished,’ but as the previous utterances are not given in John, the suitability can only be explained if the saying was actually uttered. The introductory words, ‘ Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished,’ which are an interpretative statement of the evangelist, together with the word ‘ therefore,’ which comes later—‘ when Jesus therefore had received the vinegar’—shew that in the writer’s opinion ‘ I thirst’ and the offering of the vinegar are to be regarded as the last of the things to be ‘ finished’ according to the scriptures, and so afford evidence that in his judgment ‘ It is finished’ was likewise authentic. Otherwise he would hardly have taken the trouble to emphasise the not very obvious connexion between the two sayings.

Immediately after saying ‘ It is finished,’ according to John, Jesus ‘ bowed his head, and gave up his spirit.’ In a measure the words follow a formula. Of Jacob we read, ‘ He lifted up his feet on the bed, and died’ (Gen. xlix. 33). Similar statements are found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, ‘ And he stretched out his feet on the bed, and was gathered to his fathers’ (Lev. xix. 4), ‘ And he stretched out his feet, and died’ (Iss. vii. 9), ‘ He covered his face, and died’

(Nap. ix. 2), 'And he lifted up his feet, and fell asleep in peace' (Gad viii. 4), 'He stretched out his feet, and died' (Jos. xx. 4; Ben. xii. 1-2). The words 'and gave up his spirit' evidently have in view a saying of Jesus given earlier in the fourth gospel, 'I lay down my soul, that I may take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again' (x. 17-18). A statement to a similar effect is in Mark, 'The Son of man came . . . to give his soul a ransom for many' (x. 45). Both sayings are traceable to the description of the Servant of Jehovah in the second Isaiah, 'The Lord gave him up for our sins . . . for whom his soul was given up to death . . . and he was given up for our iniquities' (liii. 6, 12). The thought behind the words 'he gave up his spirit' is therefore sacrificial, that Jesus died 'an offering for sin' (Is. liii. 10), and that He offered the sacrifice Himself.

We may now return to the account in Luke, 'And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and said, Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit, and when he had said this, he expired' (xxiii. 46). The statement in John that 'he gave up his spirit' seems at first

sight to be parallel in substance as in position, though in shorter form. Yet the passage from Luke contains nothing sacrificial. The saying is a quotation from the psalter, ' Into thy hands I will commit my spirit ' (xxx. (xxxii.) 5). The thought is that of entrusting the spirit to God's care, in life not in death. We compare ' Thy visitation hath preserved my spirit ' (Job x. 12). The verb and general thought are found also in the first epistle of Peter, ' Let them . . . commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator ' (iv. 19). Again the reference is to the living. In the Old Testament at death the spirit is not committed, but departs to God. ' The spirit shall return unto God who gave it ' (Ecc. xii. 7). The spirits or souls of the departed in the book of Wisdom are regarded as being in God's keeping. ' The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment shall touch them ' (iii. 1). Yet there is no thought of committing the soul to God in death. This is claimed by Jesus as a special prerogative. ' I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father ' (John x. 18). Properly, then, Jesus only could apply the words of the psalm to His death, ' Into thy hands I will commit my spirit.' Yet

there is a big difference between the thought of entrusting the soul to God's charge in death, and giving up the soul to death in sacrifice. The parallel passages of Luke and John give thus two quite different ideas with regard to the yielding up of Christ's soul in death, and they must be regarded as two distinct developments from the original primitive tradition. Which is the more authentic ? The thought found in John is in complete agreement with our Lord's teaching elsewhere, while that in Luke is found in no other passage. We must decide, then, that in this case the earlier form of the tradition appears in John, that in Luke being an interpretative development based on an incomplete understanding of the original. If this be so, the saying 'Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit' has no claim to be part of the earliest form of the evangelical tradition with regard to our Lord's death, but is an editorial addition, externalising as a saying of Jesus what under the influence of the psalter the evangelist took to be the meaning of a statement to the effect that Jesus 'gave up his spirit,' as it appears in the fourth gospel. We have already noticed several examples of a statement in the text in one form of the gospel tradition appearing

in a later as a saying of Jesus, or others, as ' Answerest thou nothing ? what is it which these witness against thee ? ' in Mark (xiv. 60) taking the place of ' But he answered him nothing. And the chief priests and the scribes stood, vehemently accusing him ' in Luke (xxiii. 9-10), and ' Ye know that after two days the passover cometh ' in Matthew (xxvi. 2) taking the place of ' Now after two days was the feast of the passover ' in Mark (xiv. 1), so that it is not surprising to find the same change even in the text of Luke. The influence of the psalter in determining the significance of a statement is likewise paralleled elsewhere, as when the offering of vinegar is regarded as mockery in Luke because it is said to be such in the psalm (lxviii. (lxix.) 19-21), though it is not so interpreted in John.

The description of the death of Jesus in Luke cannot be adequately discussed apart from the similar account of the death of Stephen given in Acts. ' And he cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge: and having said this, he fell asleep ' (vii. 60). We notice the close agreement in form and word with what we find in the gospel. ' And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and said, Father, into thy hands I commit

my spirit : and having said this, he expired' (xxiii. 46). The substance of our Lord's saying is likewise paralleled in the words of Stephen, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit' (vii. 59). The two narratives cannot be independent, and must be ascribed to Luke or his source, one evidently being modelled on the other. But though superficially 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit' and 'Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit' appear to be equivalent, in reality they are very different. Stephen's prayer is addressed to Jesus, not to the Father, and in substance is in close agreement with sayings of Jesus which there is no reason to suppose other than authentic. 'Make to yourselves friends . . . that . . . they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles' (Luke xvi. 9), 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise' (Luke xxiii. 43). As Stephen looked up into heaven and saw Jesus standing on the right hand of God, in view of these words nothing could be more appropriate than the cry 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,' but, as we have seen, no such appropriateness is to be found in the saying attributed to Jesus. It seems certain that the narrative in Acts is primary, but that the primitive gospel tradition has been modified so as to agree, as closely as possible,

in form and substance with it. The affinity which exists between what we find in the Johannine version of the story, and what we find in Acts, would suggest the assimilation of the two, the words of the psalm, ‘ Into thy hands I will commit my spirit,’ the suitability of which could hardly fail to appeal to those who were anxious to see the fulfilment of prophecy in every detail of the narrative, being at hand to supply an appropriate formula, a word of prophecy, as we have seen with regard to various other points, so easily passing into a statement of fact.

Both Jesus and Stephen we are told ‘ cried with a loud voice ’ when uttering the final word, the verb in the gospel being akin to the noun, though not in Acts. The cognate words, as in the gospel, appear together also in Acts, ‘ Paul cried with a loud voice ’ (xvi. 28), and likewise in the Septuagint, ‘ The king cried with a loud voice ’ (Dan. v. 7). The expression ‘ loud voice ’ is common in the Lukan writings, appearing six times in the gospel (iv. 33, viii. 28, xvii. 15, xix. 37, xxiii. 23, 46), and six times in Acts (vii. 57, 60, viii. 7, xiv. 10, xvi. 28, xxvi. 24), though only four times in Mark (i. 26, v. 7, xv. 34, 37), and twice (certainly) in Matthew (xxvii. 46, 50), in

contexts derived from Luke. It is very frequent in the Septuagint.

Of Jesus we read in Luke, ‘And when he had said this, he expired,’ and of Stephen in Acts, ‘And when he had said this, he fell asleep.’ The formula appears also in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, ‘And Judah, when he had said these things, fell asleep’ (Jud. xxvi. 4), ‘And when he had said these things, he fell asleep’ (Zeb. x. 6), ‘And when he had said these things, he kissed them, and fell asleep’ (Dan vii. 1), ‘And when he had said these things, he stretched out his feet, and fell asleep’ (Jos. xx. 4; Ben. xii. 1–2).

An examination of the phraseology thus shews that the accounts of the deaths of Jesus and Stephen were compiled by someone well versed in the Septuagint and other Jewish literature current at the time, and that they were intended to follow the same model, which in part is found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

In Mark we read : ‘And Jesus uttered a loud voice, and expired’ (xv. 37). This is one of the four passages where the expression ‘a loud voice’ appears in the second gospel, all being repeated from the tradition given in Luke. ‘Utter’ is not used with ‘voice’

elsewhere in the New Testament, but it is found once in the Septuagint, ‘And he uttered his voice with weeping’ (Gen. xlvi. 2). We notice that nothing is said in Mark about the saying, ‘Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit.’ Perhaps it was realised that it was an interpretative addition, though indeed the other two sayings from the cross in Luke are likewise omitted in Mark. The words, ‘and when he had said this,’ which link the account of the death of Jesus in Luke with that of the death of Stephen in Acts, and with the accounts of the deaths of Judah, Zebulon, Dan, Joseph and Benjamin in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, are also omitted. The word translated ‘expired,’ repeated from Luke, is found nowhere else in the Old or New Testament. It is not until after the death of Jesus that Mark gives his version of the statement from the Testament of Levi (x. 3) about the veil of the temple. What in Luke is one of the accompaniments of the three hours’ darkness becomes thus a portent at our Lord’s death. The changes made in the statement seem to shew that Mark understood it literally. ‘And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom’ (xv. 38). The secondary nature of Mark’s narrative seems

clear, and it can only be explained as a modification of that in Luke.

In Matthew we read : ‘ And Jesus cried again with a loud voice, and yielded up his spirit. And behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom ’ (xxvii. 50–51). On the whole Matthew agrees with Mark rather than Luke, but in several points there is a return to what we find in the third gospel. Again we read ‘ cried with a loud voice ’ and not ‘ uttered a loud voice ’ as in Mark. The verb translated ‘ cried,’ however, is not the cognate word to ‘ voice ’ as in Luke, but the verb used in the account of the death of Stephen in Acts, where we read similarly ‘ cried with a loud voice,’ in one of the passages where ‘ a loud voice ’ occurs in Mark (v. 7), and elsewhere. The Greek word translated ‘ uttered ’ in Mark is transferred to the next clause in Matthew, where it is rendered ‘ yielded,’ thus reproducing a phrase of the Septuagint, ‘ as she yielded up the ghost ’ (Gen. xxxv. 18), with a change of noun, ‘ spirit ’ appearing likewise in John, and a cognate verb in both Luke and Mark. Matthew follows Mark in giving the rending of the veil of the temple as a portent at the death of Jesus, and reproduces his statement with no change of importance. He makes it

however one of a number of portents which happened at the same time, several of them suggested, as we have seen, by a passage in the Testament of Levi (iv. 1), from which the notion of 'the sun's light failing' in Luke is also derived. We note the continued development of the tradition about the portents, which even in its earliest form in Luke is only an interpretative addition to a more primitive narrative which has not survived in an uninterpolated text.

Many other stories of the gospels might be examined with similar results. Enough has been said to bring out the fact that the four gospels are derived ultimately from three different traditions about Jesus, which sometimes give merely different forms evolved from a primitive gospel narrative as a common source, but for the most part narrate quite distinct incidents, which we have seen reason to attribute to the three apostles, Peter, James, and John, the Jacobean line of tradition where it exists being the most authentic. Luke is built up almost entirely of material drawn from the Petrine and Jacobean traditions, matter from each source appearing as a rule in blocks of considerable size. Mark also utilises the same two

traditions, though that of James in a much smaller degree. The Johannine tradition is also drawn upon to a considerable extent, and even the traditions of the rabbis now preserved in the Talmud and elsewhere, where they could be used to complete a picture, as in the account of the trial before the high priest and council. Mark's narrative is frequently a mosaic of small pieces of material drawn from the different sources, which are often transferred to a quite different context from that to which they properly belong. As it stands, and apart from a critical investigation of each section, the story told in Mark is at many points of little value if we wish to know exactly what happened, and particularly in the account of the Passion where the material, authentic in origin, is so recombined, expanded and repeated as to give a quite different account of events from that which we gain from Luke and John. Matthew is largely a still further developed form of Mark, with additional material from the Jacobean tradition and other sources, some of it of doubtful historical value, or even obviously apocryphal as it stands. The fourth gospel alone contains a single tradition, that derived from John. Where we have been able to test it the narrative is

frequently expanded or modified by phraseology from the Old Testament, and so probably similar development has taken place in other places. The Petrine and Johannine traditions, though inferior to the Jacobean, give much authentic material, sometimes one and sometimes the other preserving the more primitive form of the story where they can be compared. Our investigation by bringing out the method by which the several gospels took their present form has enabled us to estimate the historic value of the various narratives and provides a key for their right interpretation. The result will be very different at many points from the traditional story of our Lord's life, and many well-known incidents will be found to be later additions, to our great disappointment. Still the advantage will be great if in any degree we are able to gain a truer picture of the historic Jesus, Who stands out still as the Son of God and Saviour of mankind, and particularly if we can base it on the witness of His three chief apostles, Peter, James, and John, and so, in part at any rate, on the teaching, still largely in its primitive form, of that son of Zebedee who so early, the first of the apostolic band, received the martyr's crown.

*Eἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν,
Καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ρήματα αὐτῶν.*

*Printed in England at THE BALLANTYNE PRESS
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.
Colchester, London & Eton*

A11959

42198



BS2555 .L56

Lockton, William, 1878-
The three traditions in the Gospels /

S
555
56

Lockton, William, 1878-

The three traditions in the Gospels, an essay by W. Lockton ... London, New York, etc., Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1926.

ix, (2), 306, (2), p. 19.^m.

1. Bible. N. T. Gospels—Criticism, Interpretation, etc. I. Title

11959

Library of Congress

382555.LAC

CCSC/ef

